24081

National Library of Canada / Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE / THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* RONALD PAUL LEONARD

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* UNDERSTANDING DIFFERENT CONCEPTUAL SYSTEMS

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ *GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* M. A.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE* 1975

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* ALLEN CARLSON

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* APRIL 1, 1975 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ* Ronald Leonard

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXE* 10950 - 80 AVENUE
EDMONTON, ALBERTA
T6E 2E4

NL-91 (3-74)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

"UNDERSTANDING DIFFERENT CONCEPTUAL SYSTEMS"

by

© Ronald Leonard

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE

STUDIES AND RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

Edmonton, Alberta

Spring 1975

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled UNDERSTANDING DIFFERENT CONCEPTUAL SYSTEMS, submitted by Ronald Leonard in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Date: January 3, 1974

ABSTRACT

In an encounter with a different conceptual system various procedures may be employed in the attempt to make it intelligible. This thesis considers three salient methodologies which are based on diverse philosophical presuppositions, shows what follows from each, and explicates the one which appears most fruitful. The positions which are rejected are:

(1) that view which would attempt to understand another conceptual system exclusively by subsuming the concepts of that system under familiar conceptual categories; and

(2) the view that one must abandon one's own conceptual system and authentically adopt the other as a prerequisite to understanding.

Winch suggests that understanding a different conceptual system is best accomplished by expanding our own conceptual system, possibly requiring a revision of conceptual categories, and specifically involving an extention of our concept of intelligibility. This will result in a union of our concept of intelligibility with that of the other system. To show how this might be accomplished is the purpose of this essay.

To illustrate, I have selected the conceptual system of the Yaqui brujo, Juan Matus, as described by Carlos Castañeda following his experiences during several years as an apprentice to don Juan. The examples provided to exemplify the methodology's practical application is obviously no substitute for the actual complete procedure, nor would the latter, if successful, be sufficient for one to become a 'man of knowledge'. The methodology, however, will be seen as a powerful tool, capable of producing ever wider and more complex syntheses of conceptual systems and thereby immeasurably increasing our understanding.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I should like to express my deepest appreciation to Professor Allen Carlson who consented to supervise my thesis. His patience and willingness to entertain unusual ideas provided the opportunity to explore uncharted areas, and his ability to organize and clarify complex thoughts I found invaluable.

While my thesis was in progress I received much helpful criticism from Professors Herman Tennessen (who gave me copies of many of his paper), Wesley Cooper and Don Carmichael. I was also fortunate to have had a close association with C. Martin Coles and Eric Lawton, both fellow graduate students in philosophy, whose interest in and discussion of my work were of great benefit.

I am further indebted to Dave Cameron, another graduate student, who first introduced me to the writings of Carlos Castañeda by lending me The Teachings of Don Juan. I am also grateful to Professor Anthony Mardiros for lending me his copy of Journey to Ixtlan when it was unavailable elsewhere and to Professor Bruce Aune, who sent me a copy of his hitherto unpublished paper "Rorty on Language and the World."

Special thanks are reserved for Lynn Hardy who helped in typing preliminary drafts and to Susan Peterson whose

work in typing and proofreading the final draft was exceptional.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER — Page

1. A Statement of the Project 1
2. What is a Conceptual System? 7
3. Methodology 23
4. Application of Methodology. 46
5. Conclusion 63

FOOTNOTES TO THESIS 77

BIBLIOGRAPHY 85

APPENDIX

A. Concepts in Don Juan's Conceptual System in Context of Castaneda's Writings . . 88

FOOTNOTES APPENDIX A 116

B. An Alphabetical Listing of Concepts in Don Juan's Conceptual System, and Familiar Analogues 125

C. Concepts in Don Juan's System Categorized By Degree of Overlap with the Range of Application of Familiar Concepts 138

D. A Description of the Role of Concepts in Don Juan's System 142

E. A Categorized List of Concepts in Don Juan's Conceptual System 152

CURRICULUM VITAE 157

CHAPTER 1

A STATEMENT OF THE PROJECT

Man has been struggling since time immemorial with the problem of understanding those whose language, culture, religion, or ideology, etc., differ from his own. He has had difficulty making sense of their discourse, practices, activities, beliefs, etc., and the concepts which give meaning to their description and explanation. In short, he has been faced with the task of understanding conceptual systems which differ from his own. My purpose in this thesis will be to provide an analysis of a few specific general methodologies for this sort of undertaking, and support my preference.

The theoretical position which I wish to establish may be best set out in relation to what I will refer to as the Absolutist and Relativist positions, which in their radical form, constitute limiting cases. The crux of the Absolutist position is that when two or more conceptual systems conflict, then at most, one can be correct; the resolution of such conflicts, given this framework, must be based on an appeal to an ultimate standard of intelligibility, rationality, reality, etc. Absolutism assumes the possibility of an ideal conceptual system, a perfect mirror of reality. Any actual conceptual system will be correct to the extent to which it conforms to this ideal system.

The radical Absolutist may further assume either that the conceptual system which he has is this perfect system, or more likely that his conceptual system most closely approximates the ultimate system. He thus proceeds to attempt to understand other conceptual systems by subsuming all concepts in the other system under the conceptual categories of his own. When he attempts to understand the beliefs, practices, etc., of the other conceptual system from its members' point of view, it is to determine how their mistaken way of thinking might appear plausible to them. To illustrate this approach, Peter Winch sets out the position which a radical Absolutist from our culture would probably adopt when studying the African Azande.

> "We know that Zande beliefs in the influence of witchcraft, the efficacy of magic medicines, the role of oracles in revealing what is going on and what is going to happen, are mistaken, illusory. Scientific methods of investigation have shown conclusively that there are no relations of cause and effect such as are implied by these beliefs and practices. All we can do then is to show how such a system of mistaken beliefs and inefficacious practices can maintain itself in the face of objections that seem to us so obvious."[1]

This is in fact the way in which Alasdair MacIntyre sees the anthropologists' task. His Absolutist orientation is manifest in his position concerning the notion of "rational criticism."

> "...in explaining the rules and conventions to which action in a given social order conforms (sic) we cannot omit reference to the rationality or otherwise of those rules and conventions ...the beginning of an explanation of why certain criteria are taken to be rational in some societies is that they <u>are</u> rational. And since this has to enter into <u>our</u> explanation we cannot explain social behaviour independently of our own norms of rationality." 2

Thus he holds that our norms of rationality occupy a peculiarly central position. The radical Absolutist contends that our other norms are similarly privileged. Whereas the general Absolutist's position holds the theoretical possibility of an ultimate conceptual system, the radical position holds that our system <u>is</u> that supreme system. It is not clear that MacIntyre adheres to this extreme view ideologically, but it is plausible to interpret his comments that way.

In reaction to this sort of approach, the Relativist, represented by Winch, states his position. Forms of life are autonomous; each has its own conceptual system which contains its own criteria of intelligibility, reality and rationality. Since these concepts only have meaning within a particular form of life, they are not amenable to external criticism. There is no absolute or ultimate standard of intelligibility, rationality or reality to which anyone may appeal in order to launch such criticism. The radical Relativist goes one step further by denying that someone external to a conceptual system can even understand it; the only way to understand a different conceptual system (if

at all) is by becoming an actual participant of the form of life involved.

The general Relativist approach owes much to Wittgenstein and his followers who developed the notion of different forms of life. Kai Nielsen sketches out the "Wittgensteinian Fideist" position which is derived from a cluster of quotations taken from Wittgenstein.[3] Hudson has rather succinctly summarized this position as applied to religious discourse:

> "Religious belief can only be understood from within; and it is immune to charges of incoherence, unintelligibility, irrationality, or non-accordance with objective reality, from without, because, like any other universe of discourse, it sets its own definitive criteria of coherence, intelligibility, rationality, and reality." [4]

In order to lay the groundwork for a methodology for understanding another conceptual system which is founded on a philosophical position between these extremes, it will be desirable to clarify a number of related terms. In Chapter 2, there will be a discussion of what is to be meant by 'concept', 'conceptual system', 'world view', etc. I shall attempt to determine what it is for someone to have a conceptual system, and introduce a distinction between the form of a concept and its content in order to answer these questions:

1. What are the necessary conditions for a set of concepts to constitute a system?

2. What are the means by which we may individuate conceptual systems?

The methodology for understanding different conceptual systems, which I will develop in Chapter 3, will be based on Winch's general solution to the problem; i.e., the way in which someone from one conceptual system is to understand another conceptual system is by extending (and thus altering) one's own.[5] In particular, a person must create a union of his concept of intelligibility and that of the other system. In the course of my enterprise I will present and criticize Winch's methodology, and discuss various problems involved in constructing a general methodology.

Insofar as it is feasible within the scope of a thesis, I shall attempt to show how this methodology would be applied to an actual example of an alternate conceptual system, a system of 'sorcery' based on the writings of Carlos Castañeda.[6] Chapter 4 will contain the elaboration of the reasons for choosing this particular example, and the justification of my selection. I must caution that the reader will not necessarily extend his conceptual system by merely reading my thesis and I would exhort him to undertake the actual application of this methodology for himself.

It will be left to Chapter 5 to draw the appropriate conclusions and philosophical implications. The purpose

of this essay is to show that both the Absolutist and Relativist extremes encounter dire problems in developing a satisfactory methodology; the former will lead to misunderstanding because the context of the alien concepts will be ignored, while the latter will regard it as a theoretical impossibility to come to an understanding of another conceptual system without actually adopting it. I hope to make a strong case for the view that there is a middle road where understanding another conceptual system is a dynamic process which involves change in one's own.

CHAPTER 2

WHAT IS A CONCEPTUAL SYSTEM?

In order to develop a methodology for understanding alternate conceptual systems, we must have more than an intuitive idea of the notion of a conceptual system. The problem is twofold: we must determine the criteria for a set of concepts to constitute a system, and also set out a basis for individuating conceptual systems.

From the outset, it must be clearly stated whether 'conceptual system', and 'world view' are to be considered synonymous or are to be employed differently in order to mark important distinctions. Since neither of these terms has a well-established, common usage, then so far as this is the case, my decision may be made legitimately on the basis of the distinctions which appear to be important for my thesis, so long as they are clearly delimited and the terms are not used ambiguously.

Central questions which must be raised in this regard are: Can any set of concepts form a system? How may we resolve the tension between the extreme positions which hold that each individual has a different conceptual system, and that every individual shares a common conceptual system?

As a preliminary step, I propose to set out a form/content distinction with respect to concepts. The content of a concept is its range of application; this is equivalent to the totality of possible instances of that concept. Since for many concepts, there will be borderline cases, the range of application of a concept need not be determinate. The "content of a concept" as I am using it, should not be confused with a concept's intension where 'intension' is defined as "the internal quantity or content of a notion or concept, the sum of the attributes contained in it." Nor should it be confused with the concept's 'extension' (i.e., its range as measured by the number of objects which it denotes or contains under it). Something will qualify as part of the content of a concept if the concept simply either does or would apply to it. Several examples should illustrate what is meant. The range of application of the concept 'cat' is the totality of possible entities which would be considered to be cats; the content of the concept 'red' is the total of all possible instances of redness; the content of the concept 'greater than' is the totality of possible cases where entities of the same logical category differ in magnitude; finally, the content or range of application of the concept 'rational' is the totality of possible beliefs, practices, activities, etc., which are considered rational.

The form of a concept may be understood operationally

as the way it functions in a system; i.e., the operation(s) a concept can be used to perform. That is, at least part of the form of the concept 'red' is the role of providing a means for distinguishing between objects which are of a certain color (red) from those that are not. The form of the concept 'greater than' is the role of comparing of the magnitude of objects of the same logical category.

Between conceptual systems, there need not be any concept in one system whose content is identical to the content of some concept in another system. The same is not true of the form of certain concepts. The very notion of a conceptual system requires that in order for something to constitute a conceptual system, concepts of a particular form be present; I shall refer to them as formal constants (i.e., concepts which necessarily have functional equivalents in all possible conceptual systems). For example, Aune thinks that some mechanism for expressing existence claims is a formal constant.

> "I take it that a minimal condition to be satisfied by any possible conceptual framework is that it permit its users to make existence claims. This condition requires that any possible conceptual framework will overlap with ours at least to the extent of containing expressions at least part of whose meaning can be rendered (however roughly or approximately) by our 'There is...' or 'There exists....'. This kind of overlap is essentially formal..." 7

This is a good illustration of a concept whose form is so central to our conceptual system that we would say that an individual who did not possess a concept of this form, and thus could make a cognitive distinction between what does and does not exist, did not have a conceptual system. Although we might speculate about conceptual structures which lack one or more of these formal constants, my purpose will be best served by explicitly excluding them from this study. The concept of a conceptual system under consideration here will thus be partially defined in terms of the formal constants which I am explicating, for I believe that this captures what is of interest to those who share our conceptual system.

Let us consider other formal constants. The concept of reality may be redundant if it functions merely to separate that which is claimed to exist from that which is not; however, in some conceptual systems (ours, for example) the status of many entities cannot be adequately delimited by means of the existent/non-existent dichotomy. Thus the 'reality function' serves a different purpose than the function of expressing existence claims. The latter is roughly equivalent to an 'actuality function', as it is used to distinguish between entities which are actual from those which are not. The 'reality function' distinguishes between actual existents, e.g., the way a person exists from the way mere material objects exist;

also, it distinguishes between non-actual existents, e.g., between real and imaginary numbers. Furthermore, it is especially valuable in providing distinctions in the fuzzy area between actual and non-actual existents, e.g., between protons and tachyons.[8] The question of what sort of reality something has it not reducible to the question of its existence and thus it seems legitimate to specify two separate formal constants here.

Winch notes two other formal constants, viz., rationality and intelligibility; he claims that members of any conceptual system must either have concepts which correspond to our concepts of rationality and intelligibility or some feature of their system which fulfills these functions. What is or is not rational or intelligible in a particular system will be the content of these concepts. The form of the concept of intelligibility is the function of understanding or intellectual comprehension; without this or some functional equivalent, nothing could be understood. There would be no way to meaningfully relate beliefs, events, actions, practices, etc., to each other or the concepts in the system; everything would be experienced as an isolated given. The form of the concept of rationality is the function which orders beliefs and actions in a particular way; those beliefs and actions which are considered to be rational in a system will constitute the content of this concept.

Given a set of concepts, in order to consider it a system there must be the possibility of performing certain operations. Formal constants are those concepts whose form permits these operations, fulfilling functions which are central to any conceptual system. Whereas we regard the function of (e.g.) color concepts as contingent to a conceptual system, the functions of the concepts of 'existence', 'intelligibility', 'rationality', etc., appear to be necessary. Thus the criteria for a set of concepts to form a system will be the presence of formal constants.[9]

The formal constants which have been discussed are those which I consider most central and will form a sufficient basis for delimiting our notion of a conceptual system. The number and sort of other possible formal constants will not concern me here. 'Conceptual system' as defined in terms of formal constants is an open-ended concept; whereas the central ones are fairly obvious, those which are borderline must be included or excluded arbitrarily. For my purposes, I have drawn the line around the particular formal constants presented.

Just as the form/content distinction proved useful in establishing criteria for the application of 'conceptual system', so it may be of use in determining how conceptual systems may be individuated. Although it is generally agreed that conceptual systems depend on or arise

from forms of life, it is futile to attempt to individuate them on that basis; this would be merely to push the problem back on step as there is no ready way to individuate forms of life. Furthermore, it will be impossible to appeal to formal grounds as formal constants will necessarily be found in all conceptual systems. Also, if we strictly apply the criterion of identical conceptual content, the individual differences between beings having a conceptual system will force us to admit a unique conceptual system for each individual; there will be no shared conceptual systems. This is somewhat counter-intuitive. A further consideration is that no two individuals should be expected to have identical sets of concepts.

What I propose, therefore, is to individuate conceptual systems on the basis of the content of formal constants (i.e., what is said to exist, what kind of reality entities have, what is intelligible and what is considered rational). It is important to stress that only similarity and not identity of formal constants is required, for in the latter case we would likely be committed to the position that every individual had a different conceptual system.[10] Although strictly speaking this may be true, it is equally true that conceptual systems may be considered shared. There is necessary vagueness in what is to constitute similarity, for the context in which we wish to

say that two individuals share the same conceptual system may vary; in one instance, a single crucial discrepancy between them will be sufficient to rule out a shared system, while in another case, agreement in a particular domain will be sufficient grounds for claiming a shared system. Thus not only the quantity, but also the quality of the overlap of content of formal constants will be relevant (i.e., not only how much overlap there is, but also the nature of the overlap). For example, if the domain of religion has special importance to our discussion, we may decide that those who believe in God share a different conceptual system than avowed atheists, whereas among a group of believers, it could be decided that Christians, Jews, Moslems, etc., each shared a different conceptual system. Such distinctions need not be explicitly stated, but may merely be implied by a consistent application of the presuppositions which underlie the system.

When an attempt is made to make such presuppositions explicit, and form a total picture of the world, then we have what I would refer to as a 'world view'. Such systems as those of Aristotle, Spinoza and Leibniz illustrate this concept. This is not to claim that a 'world view' <u>is</u> without implicit presuppositions, for that I contend is logically impossible. Every presupposition is itself based upon further presuppositions. The

process by which we make implicit presuppositions explicit may be continued ab perpetuam; there is no point at which the regress terminates. Therefore, there can be no explicit total 'world view'. The impossibility in principle of formulating an explicit total 'world view' is forcefully argued by Herman Tennessen.

> "An initial, but rather fundamental obstacle seems here embarrassingly obvious: in the sense of 'world' which I strive to employ here, my 'world' necessarily embraces everything, comprising inter alia the only conceptual framework from which I can possibly draw the standards for evaluation of anything. And this does not only include any appraisals of the veridicality of my total view, of the 'reality' of my 'world', but the assessment of the meaningfulness or absurdity of this very question... I see, at any rate, no way for me to arrive at an assessment of my world without presupposing a frame of reference entailed in and by that world of mine. Were I to employ a different frame of reference (---acquired from where?---) and apply it to my world, in what sense of 'my world' would it then be my world to which it was applied? Certainly not in the sense of my total view, my 'system' or 'synthesis'---which is, after all, the traditional philosophical world for a consistent, principally all-embracing total view, with its logic, ontology, epistemology, value-system, etc....." 11

Thus the attempt to set out a total 'world view' is the epitome of bootstraps-tugging. The notion of an explicit total system is an impossible ideal not only contingently but in principle.

Although there cannot be an explicit total 'world view', and this holds also with respect to conceptual systems (or conceptual frameworks) there is no reason to

prejudge the issue of whether there might be an implicit total 'world view'. Such a notion would be without practical application, however, as it could never be explicated; what we are interested in for the purpose of this essay is the sense of 'conceptual system' which has been defined. In this sense, alternate conceptual systems are possible, and may be detected and compared, although there is a crucial asymmetry between comparing two or more conceptual systems other than our own and comparing another conceptual system with ours. In the first case, we may broaden our understanding of the systems involved, for the criteria which are used for comparison are taken from our conceptual system and applied equally to the systems under consideration. The second case, however, presents problems, for there is no external point of view which we can assume in order to 'objectively' compare our conceptual system with any other; we are inextricably caught up in our system, and this involves a necessary limitation on any attempt to come to understand an alternate conceptual framework.[12]

Whereas a 'world view' is necessarily intended to be a total system, a conceptual system need not be. As a rule, conceptual systems arise from a form of life; 'world views' are ideal philosophical constructs, consciously and intentionally designed by individuals who already employ a conceptual system. There is a variable

degree of overlap between conceptual systems. If there were no overlap whatsoever (or total overlap) between conceptual systems, then the notion of an alternate conceptual system would be vacuous.[13]

The means for determining what constitutes overlap between conceptual systems may be developed by philosophical analysis. For example, if we assume that a concept is a discreet entity, and that the overlap between conceptual systems consists of the sharing of a common subset of these entities, then the only concepts of another system (if any) that we can ever be said to understand, without actually becoming a participant of that system, will be in the area of overlap, and we will understand them as part of our conceptual system.[14] If we wish to explain how we come to understand other conceptual systems, this assumption must be rejected.

Also, if we assume that a sufficient condition for the sharing of a concept by members of different conceptual systems is that a certain concept in one system has the same content as a concept in the other system, we will be misled. That is, if members of a conceptual system S apply a concept 'R' to those, and only those things to which we apply the concept 'red', we are not yet justified in claiming that 'R' is identical to 'red', and that we are to understand their concept in just this way. If the form of life of members of S is such that the only

color distinction which they are capable of making, or find worthwhile making, is between R and not-R, then their system of classifying objects according to color varies significantly from ours, such that it is no longer clear that we should regard 'R' and 'red' as equivalent concepts. We are justified in concluding that not only the range of application of a concept, but also its relation(s) to other concepts in a system is an important consideration for regarding a concept as shared, and hence is an important factor for understanding concepts in other systems.

The rejection of the previous assumption and a modification which takes into account the relations between concepts within a system is indicated. This leads to the conclusion that overlap between conceptual systems is a matter of degree which increases in proportion to:

1. the number of concepts in the other system whose range of application overlaps with concepts in our system;
2. the degree to which the ranges of application overlap;
3. the number of concepts in that system which play a similar role in that system as familiar concepts play in ours;
4. the degree of similarity of these roles.

Of course, some concepts and relations will be more important than others, but there is no definite general procedure for determining a central core of relations or concepts which could be considered sufficient for understanding a particular concept. Thus overlap between conceptual systems consists of concepts which either have identical or similar ranges of application or play the same or similar roles in their respective systems (i.e., overlap of content or overlap of form).

There is an important distinction between formal constants and other concepts in a system, such that we may regard the overlap between conceptual systems as falling under four distinct categories: form of formal constants, content of formal constants, form of concepts other than formal constants, and content of concepts other than formal constants. The most obvious case of overlap is where the content of certain concepts (other than formal constants) is found to be similar; i.e., where the range of application of certain concepts in one system intersects significantly with the range of application of certain concepts in another system. This identical, similar or analogous conceptual content constitutes an individual's prima facie understanding of a conceptual system which overlaps with his own. It consists of the intersection of concepts where they cover the same ground. For example, there is partial overlap

between our conceptual system and that of various Hottentot tribes with respect to the concept of number. The overlap consists of the content of the concepts for the set of integers: one, two, three; we find that the range of application is virtually identical in both systems. For larger collections of objects, however, they use a term which corresponds closely to 'many'.[16] Its range of application is not identical to that of our concept, however, since our use of 'many' involves a large number of objects whereas they will apply it equally to four or five objects as to a hundred. Of course, our concept of number is far wider than could be comprised by the set of finite, positive integers and thus is wider than the Hottentot's concept of number. However, even if the content of the two concepts proved identical, that would be insufficient grounds for asserting their identity, for the role each plays in its respective system must also be taken into consideration.

In addition to overlap of content, we also have overlap of form; this consists of the functional similarity of concepts in their respective systems. Conceptual systems overlap in conceptual form where certain concepts work in the same way within each system; this contrasts with the overlap of conceptual content which consists of covering the same ground.[17] For our purposes, it is possible to equate the way in which a concept functions in

a system with its role in that system. With respect to the Hottentot example, their concept of number functions in a similar manner to the primary function of our concept of number (i.e., to answer the question, "How many?").

The most important sense of overlap of conceptual systems is the degree of similarity of formal constants. (As we have seen, the form of these concepts, i.e., their function in any conceptual system, will be identical, but this overlap is simply a necessary condition for the application of the term 'conceptual system'.) For example, both the Christian and the Satanist regard their respective concepts of Satan as corresponding to an actual existent; this indicates an important point of convergence between their systems. On the other hand, a Christian regards the activity of worshipping Satan as irrational (i.e., no rational Christian would ever engage in such an activity); the reverse would be true of the Satanist. Here their conceptual systems diverge.

We now have a theoretical means for individuating conceptual systems, but it is problematic how this is to work in practice. It is neither necessary nor desirable to construct a set of strict conditions for deciding whether or not two people share the same conceptual system. In general, this will depend upon a particular domain

which is for some reason of special interest; this area must be of sufficient scope to warrant the ascription of shared or divergent systems on the basis of similarity or difference of the content of formal constants with respect to this domain. For example, religious and ethical systems constitute two such domains. I must emphasize that little hangs on the vagueness of the criteria for individuating conceptual systems; what is of importance is the actual differences and similarities between individuals having conceptual systems, and between the systems themselves.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Our problem is: Given the background of our conceptual system, which methodology will be best for achieving an understanding of other conceptual systems? For the purpose of clarification, I shall present a preliminary discussion on understanding. Next, Winch's attempt to provide a methodology for understanding a different conceptual system will be criticized. Finally, I will develop an adaptation of his methodology using his principle of extention of the concept of intelligibility and the notion of overlap between conceptual systems.

In addition to 'conceptual system', another key term which requires elaboration is 'understanding'. Various senses of our ordinary notion of understanding have been analyzed by Brodbeck;[18] they may be summarized as follows:

1. Understanding$_1$---In order to understand a language:
   (a) I must know the conditions for application of at least some terms (an unspecified number);

(b) others I may understand in context when combined with terms whose conditions of application I know.

2. Understanding$_2$----This sense of understanding requires that one have undergone certain experiences or have participated in certain events, and had the special feeling, emotions or attitudes which only these experiences could have aroused. I must know from memory the unique feelings referred to by these terms or associated with them. Thus what I do not understand$_2$ I may understand$_1$.

3. Understanding$_3$---To understand$_3$ the meaning of a term, one must understand$_1$ its referential meaning and understand$_2$ the meaning of the terms which describe the relevant feelings, emotions, etc.

4. Understanding$_4$----Being aware of the motives or purposes for which an action was performed.

5. Understanding$_5$---We understand the significance of a kind of thing, event or behaviour through the association of these with other things, events or behaviour to which we know or believe they are related (i.e., when they do not appear to us as isolated).

These senses of 'understanding' are distinguished primarily by the various objects of understanding, viz.,

languages, terms in a language, special and general feelings, emotions and attitudes, actions and the significance of things, events or behaviour (or to put the latter obliquely, we may be said to understand the things, events or behaviour themselves). However, Brodbeck's analysis of understanding is incomplete. We may also be said to understand people (i.e., particular persons with whom we are acquainted, or people in general), forms of life, concepts, conceptual schemes, conceptual systems, world views, categorical frameworks, cultures, societies, rules, conventions, beliefs, practices, and activities. No sense of 'understanding' thus far defined is entirely adequate for any of these cases, although understanding$_5$ is the closest approximation. These examples could only be subsumed under understanding$_5$ if these objects of understanding were regarded as things, events or behaviour. Oversimplification appears to be the likely result of such a move. Furthermore, the nature of the association with related things, events or behaviour is in need of discussion. However, Brodbeck is correct in her general formulation of understanding$_5$, showing the necessity of relating the object of understanding to something else in order that it not appear isolated. Also, the caution against assuming a single sense of 'understanding' is well taken.

For the purposes of my enterprise, it is essential that we determine what it is that we are attempting to understand, which sense(s) of 'understanding' are applicable, and what will constitute achieving the desired understanding. Our primary concern is to understand conceptual systems which we do not share. This may be viewed as equivalent to understanding the concepts which comprise it, especially the formal constants.

Furthermore, understanding a conceptual system is usually related to understanding the form of life upon which it is based, which is equivalent to understanding the beliefs, practices, activities, etc., which comprise it. These will illustrate the range of application of various concepts in the system, above all the formal constants. I will be unable to discuss the relationship between the concepts of an individual's conceptual system and the form of life of which he is a participant, but I will assume that if one understands the former, then one will understand the latter as well.

In my attempt to set out a methodology for understanding other conceptual systems, I shall begin by discussing Winch's theory. His basic solution to the central problem of understanding another form of life involves the extention of our conceptual system.[19] He rejects the methodology which would subsume all concepts of a differ-

ent system under our presently understood conceptual categories because he considers such a program to be intrinsically inadequate, thereby resulting in misunderstanding the form of life we wish to study. I agree with his general position, especially his proposal to develop a methodology which will incorporate a conceptual extention of our system.[20] One would suspect that as a social scientist, Winch is more interested in developing a scientific rather than a philosophical methodology. However, he makes no sharp distinction between them in the work cited, so I shall simply take his remarks at face value as I attempt to determine whether or not his methodology is satisfactory for my purposes.

According to the analysis in Chapter 2, conceptual systems are subject to certain formal requirements in the way of necessary formal constants. It is the formal constant of intelligibility which is central to Winch's proposed methodology; he sees his task to be the creation of "a new unity for the concept of intelligiblity, having a certain relation to our old one and perhaps requiring a considerable realignment of our categories."[21] This will necessarily involve extending our conceptual system, for on his account, a proper understanding of another way of life cannot be achieved by analyzing it solely in terms

of our present concepts. He contends that if certain practices of another society appear at first unintelligible to us but not to members of that society, then it is misguided to direct our efforts towards an attempt to determine why practices which are in fact unintelligible according to our conceptual system should appear intelligible to them. Their concept of intelligiblity differs from ours such that in their system these practices <u>are</u> intelligible.[22] What Winch claims is required is a modification of our concept of intelligibility which takes the other into account. A successful extention of this concept would result in a new perspective on the alien practices, making them fully intelligible to us (with respect to our extended concept of intelligiblity and hence with respect to our extended conceptual system). I would caution that this certainly does not entail that we would have the "same understanding" as a native of that culture. The most obvious discrepancy will be with respect to the lack of first-hand experiences necessary for understanding$_2$ for which full participation in that form of life is necessary. Another difference will be that we will still regard our original conceptual system and the practices, activities, etc., of the corresponding form of life as intelligible; the native of the other system need not. Even were the na-

tive to extend his concept of intelligibility in a similar manner, would he have the "same understanding"? This is doubtful, for the different starting points suggest different results. Fortunately, we need not attain the "same understanding" in this sense in order to have the alien system appear intelligible, nor is it necessary for Winch's enterprise.

> "We are not seeking a state in which things will appear to us just as they do to members of S, and perhaps such a state is unattainable anyway. But we are seeking a way of looking at things which goes beyond our previous way in that it has in some way taken account of and incorporated the other way that members of S have of looking at things. Seriously to study another way of life is necessarily to seek to extend our own---not simply to bring the other way within the already existing boundaries of our own, because the point about the latter in their present form, is that they ex hypothesi exclude that other."[23]

Winch considers that activities which are an expression of a form of life are generally subject to rules and conventions, and it is essential to his project that we come to determine the point of these rules and conventions in other societies (if they do have a point).[24] However, as he notes, the difficulty in doing so is that we cannot regard our own rules and conventions as objectively privileged. This does not simply mean that an observer from the society which we are studying would have

equal justification in regarding the rules and conventions of his form of life as paradigms of what it is for rules and conventions to have a point; our rules and conventions may be (or become) equally pointless to us. Thus he contends that an account of what it is for rules and conventions to have a point cannot be given satisfactorily merely in terms of any set of rules and conventions; we must consider their relation to something else. This something else, according to Winch, is "a sense of the significance of human life,"[25] a notion which he thinks indispensible to a proper methodology for understanding an alien culture.

He attempts to explicate this central factor by means of the elaboration of certain 'limiting concepts'.[26]

> "The very conception of human life involves certain fundamental notions---which I shall call 'limiting notions'---birth, death, sexual relations....The specific forms which these concepts take, the particular institutions in which they are expressed, vary very considerably from one society to another; but their central position within a society's institutions is and must be a constant factor."[27]

This conceptual trilogy (birth, death, sexual relations) constitutes the backbone of Winch's methodology. He seems committed to holding that the existence of a nucleus of universally found concepts of identical (or at least closely similar) content, which are invariably central

to a conceptual system, is a necessary prerequisite for the possibility of solving the central problem; further, that the concepts which delimit the notion of human life constitute this nucleus.

> "In any attempt to understand the life of another society, therefore, an investigation of the forms taken by such concepts---their role in the life of the society---must always take a central place and provide a basis on which understanding may be built." 28

In summary, Winch's position may be stated as follows: Understanding another conceptual system necessarily involves the extention of our own. This extention must take place by a creative union of our concept of intelligibility with that of the other conceptual system. The way in which this occurs is by determining the point of the rules and conventions which govern the other form of life. These rules and conventions must be related to something else, viz., a sense of the significance of human life. The notion of human life is to be understood in terms of the limiting concepts of birth, death, and sexual relations, which occupy a central position in the institutions of all societies. Furthermore, these concepts must occupy this central position. Understanding a society must be based upon investigation of the role these concepts play in the life of that society.

As it stands, this position is not wholly tenable,

and the extent to which we are unwilling to follow Winch is a matter of the degree of generality we seek in formulating a methodology for coming to understand other conceptual systems. But let us now consider several specific criticisms of Winch's position. Even if we were to grant the universality of the 'limiting notions' of birth, death and sexual relations, whether or not these concepts occupy a central position in all conceptual systems is open to question. I have already argued that some concepts (viz., the formal constants) are necessarily universal. Other concepts may be contingently universal; they may be found in all conceptual systems, without their presence constituting a necessary condition for calling the set of concepts a system. In either case, the presence of such a concept does not entail that it is central to all conceptual systems. (I take it that Winch means by a central concept one to which other concepts are to be related in order to be understood.) There are no theoretical grounds for assuming that the concepts central to one system are (much less must be) central to another system. Furthermore, the assumption that there must be central concepts of this sort is open to question.

In any case, the claim that these concepts are necessarily universal implies that they are in fact universal; this is not borne out by investigation, for we find many counterexamples. In a theocracy, for example,

the point of institutionalized practices is primarily religious.[29] To counter by claiming that religion must be understood in terms of the three alleged central concepts would constitute a petitio principii.

Winch's claim that the basis for understanding a society is an investigation of the role of the 'limiting concepts' in the life of that society would appear to be based upon the presupposition that understanding a society must be based upon investigation of the role of central concepts in its life. If so, then since these concepts are not necessarily central, his position is theoretically unsound.

If his claim is not based on the above presupposition, he might look to the remainder of his position for support. In that event, we should note that the claim that the notion of human life is understood in terms of the 'limiting notions' of birth, death and sexual relations is suspect. Human life cannot be defined analytically in terms of these concepts without begging the question. It is a contingent matter that thus far we know of no immortal or asexual forms of human life. If such societies exist, or were to exist, the concepts of 'death' and 'sexual relations', etc., in their conceptual system would likely be of negligible importance.

There are further difficulties with Winch's account. A point of some consequence for Winch is that "we may learn by studying other cultures...different possibilities of making sense of human life, different ideas about the possible importance that the carrying out of certain activities may take on for a man..."[30] However, there is both an individual and a cultural factor which determine whether a man sees a point in what he is doing.

> "Whether a man sees point in what he is doing will then depend on whether he is able to see any unity in his multifarious interests, activities and relations with other men; what sort of sense he sees in his life will depend on the nature of this unity." [31]

If this constitutes the criterion for activity having a point, then we find that most activity in which we are engaged turns out to be pointless. As a matter of fact, though, most of what we do makes sense to us, as well as to members of our culture, but not necessarily in the light of some total unity as we contemplate our lives as a whole; rather, it has a point on a more limited basis, a fragment of our total existence. We see point in what we do in relation to the motives and purposes for our actions, and this provides the basis for an important sense of understanding. Thus Winch's account of what it is for an agent to see point in his activity is faulty.

Besides, given our revised account where an agent's actions may have a point in relation to his limited motives and purposes, activity which is pointless from the agent's viewpoint may yet be understood; if an action has been performed without motive or purpose, only that sense of understanding (understanding$_4$) would be precluded. However, we may understand his actions on the basis of (e.g.) the institutions whose rules lend these sorts of actions significance. Apart from the criteria for having a point which is based on individual motives and purposes, we find a wider base in the culture as a whole, i.e., in the possibilities for making sense of human life a culture does or does not provide. But Winch is also unable to exploit this factor successfully in establishing a methodology. The difficulty is that we cannot ascertain a priori which, if any, of these possibilities for making sense of human life we are to relate to a particular activity within another culture in order to provide a means of gaining understanding. Here, we also find no adequate grounds for constructing a general methodology.

We may agree with Winch's contention that in general, we cannot achieve a satisfactory understanding of every element of another culture if we consider it solely in isolation from certain other related elements of that

culture. However, his endeavour to discover some concept or set of concepts having similar content which will be uniformly central to any society, and in terms of which all activity within any given society could be understood, was clearly misguided. If the universal concepts are only to be comprehended as contingent elements of a conceptual system, then on theoretical grounds they cannot form the basis for a general methodology. Given an alternate conceptual system, there is no certainty that there will be any concept of similar content to the proposed universals. And even if we find such concepts, their status may not be central to that system.[32] If we set out to derive a general methodology from a set of universal concepts, this could only be successful on the basis of an appeal to the formal constants. The value of Winch's theory is to show the link between understanding and the formal constant of intelligibility, i.e., that understanding is achieved by means of expanding the content of our concept of intelligibility. His methodology, unfortunately, is subject to the limitations which we have discussed, and this has shown it to be inadequate theoretically, although it may be of value as a practical program.[33]

How then are we to proceed in our quest for a means of coming to understand the forms of life of those who

do not share our conceptual system, and make the system itself intelligible? How is the notion of overlap between conceptual systems to be illustrated and developed into a methodology for coming to understand another conceptual system? On the assumption that we can and do come to understand different conceptual systems, how does this come about and in what does it consist? It would be well to consider various possible approaches for achieving understanding of other conceptual systems in order to clarify the appropriate methodology involved in this activity. On Winch's account, we should expect a successful attempt to show this as a function of an extention of our own conceptual system. Minimally, this would simply be an extention of the content of our concept of intelligibility.

How then are we to portray the extention of our conceptual system which is involved in the enterprise of coming to comprehend an alien concept? The simplest proposal is that it is a process of accumulation whereby the new concept, when properly understood, is merely added to our system. According to this view, all that is required is that we be able to locate its position in our system in terms of its logical geography, i.e., its relations to the range of application of existing conceptual categories of our system. The new concept is not

merely subsumed under the previously understood conceptual categories, but becomes a conceptual category of equal standing.

If, as we have argued, our understanding of a concept involves understanding the relations it has to other concepts, then this approach will be deficient in two respects:

1. It fails to indicate how the concept is related to other key concepts in its original context and the dependence of a proper understanding upon a satisfactory appraisal of these realtions.
2. The presence of a new concept in our conceptual system implies a re-evaluation of those previously understood concepts in terms of which it is to be understood.

Thus simple accumulation is also an unsatisfactory model as the basis for the desired methodology. Nevertheless, we are now in a position to construct a positive account not subject to any of the preceding difficulties.

This methodology will be extremely flexible due to the latitude I have used in defining what is meant by different conceptual systems. Not only must it be applicable to cases as remote to our system as, e.g., the Hopi, but also in cases where we share a common culture and natural language with those whose system we do not share (e.g., Scientologists). Again, in these instances,

whether or not we wish to say that we share a common conceptual system will be a matter of context. In any case, there is no general a priori method for matching concepts with linguistic units, for there is no 1:1 correspondence between linguistic forms and conceptual categories, and although we may originally make simplifying assumptions that members of the other system "dissect reality" pretty much the way we do, the actual concepts must be determined by discovering the "fashions of speech" employed in the discourse of members of that system, whether their native tongue resembles ours or not.[34] This suggests the desirability of ready access to native discourse in order to be able to detect fashions of speech, and when this has been done, it is justifiable to arrange the material accordingly, albeit fallibly. It will not be possible within this study to set about determining what constitutes different fashions of speech or indicate a specific procedure for identifying them. Practical suggestions for conducting an investigation of a different conceptual system should not be confused with the philosophical methodology involved.

Our primary understanding of an alternate conceptual system (which is akin to understanding$_1$) will be the knowledge of the range of application of various concepts and their role in the other system. From this we may deter-

mine these respective kinds of overlap with our system (i.e., the extent to which the alien concepts have identical ranges of application with familiar concepts, or play a similar role in their system as familiar concepts play in ours. There can be no specific procedure (guaranteed to be universally valid) for acquiring this knowledge; thus a case by case approach is called for.

The general effect of this process will be to increase the content of our concept of intelligibility, and our understanding of the other system will increase as a function of the extention of overlap of the content of this formal constant. Concepts which are initially unintelligible to us (i.e., whose form and content do not appear to overlap with the form and content of any concept in our system) may be made intelligible ff we can determine their relationship to other concepts in that system which do not overlap with familiar concepts. Thus as in understanding, they will no longer appear isolated.

The addition of these alien concepts to the content of our concept of intelligibility may produce tension in our conceptual system, for a concept which is intelligible in a system need not be compatible with other concepts in that system. If we are to truly integrate these foreign concepts, we must be prepared to alter our own system in some way other than the mere addition of these

cepts. What will likely be required is the creation of new conceptual categories which, in relation to the concepts which are *prima facie* incompatible, resolve the conflict.

A successful resolution of this problem will magnify the tension with respect to the other formal constants. Each of these in turn may be resolved by similar conceptual revolutions. Rationality, reality, and actuality functions, etc., will all be subject to dynamic change.

Although it is unlikely, it is possible to know the criteria for application for an alien concept as well as its function in the system (and thus come to understand what constitutes the content of the formal constants of that system) without changing more than our concept of intelligibility. We may yet reject the existence claims made by individuals in the other system, or regard their practices and activities as irrational. Even though we learn to describe and explain these beliefs, events, activities, etc., in the native idiom, our present concepts of rationality, reality, etc., will remain a barrier to further understanding so long as they remain static. A stronger sense of 'understanding' than mere intelligibility is possible; it will involve bringing the alien concepts into relation with our system in a way which is dynamic (i.e., in a way which drastically alters

our system). When we not only understand that certain beliefs, practices, etc., are rational, etc., to people who have another conceptual system, but understand how they are rational, etc., then, and only then, will we have achieved understanding of the other system, not a participant's understanding, but the closest that we can come without abandoning our original conceptual system altogether in favor of the other. This will entail a change in our other formal constants (rationality, reality, etc.). The understanding of the alien system which has already been achieved by extending our concept of intelligibility is a prerequisite for this further move.[35]

A revolutionary change in our conceptual system is required in order to make the activities and practices of the other system and ours appear equally rational and to resolve the conflicts which arise between these systems. Since it is not sufficient merely to create new conceptual categories corresponding to certain concepts in another conceptual system, we will be required to restructure and modify many of our original conceptual categories in a creative synthesis of what is already understood and what is only partially understood. This will resolve possible crises resulting from the addition of new conceptual categories which conflict with those

originally comprising part of our system, but because it will be the outcome of a creative process it cannot be the result of any a priori procedure nor need there be a unique result. Although all of what is intelligible in both systems should be intelligible in the resulting system, the same is not necessarily the case with respect to the other formal constants. It is logically possible that this might happen, but it is very unlikely, and certainly this methodology does not require such an outcome. There is no a priori method of determining how much of what is regarded as real, rational, etc., in either our original system or the system we wish to understand will remain so in the extended system. Extension of our conceptual system through the application of this methodology is thus best comprehended in terms of the necessary increase in content of the concept of intelligibility.

Since similarity of content of formal constants is the criterion upon which conceptual systems are individuated, there are grounds for claiming that we have a different conceptual system than our original one:

1. after our concept of intelligibility alters;
   or
2. after the content of our other formal constants changes.

Whether or not we will wish to claim that we still share the same system will depend on the extent of the changes and the importance of the resulting dissimilarities with respect to the context of the discussion.

In summary then, if we recognize that an individual or group of individuals has a conceptual system, and that it is in some important way different from the system which we share, then the way in which we may best understand that system without actually becoming participants is by means of this methodology:[36]

1. (a) Determine the range of application of concepts other than formal constants in the other system.
   (b) Ascertain the degree of overlap with familiar concepts.
   (c) Set out the role of each concept in the system. Formulate a description of all central concepts of that system and their inter-relation from the perspective of the alien system using whatever categorization appears to reflect the structure of the system.
   (d) Indicate analogies and disanalogies between the roles of these concepts and those of our system.

2. Extend our concept of intelligibility by expanding the overlap of form and content between the two systems; make concepts with no overlap intelligible in terms of their relations to concepts in the system which do overlap with concepts in ours. If this results in tension in our system, resolve it by restructuring our system, creating new conceptual categories if necessary.
3. Determine the content of the other crucial formal constants in the other system. Extend the content of our formal constants accordingly such that as much as possible of what is real, rational, etc., in the other system becomes real, rational, etc., in our extended system. Resolve the resulting tension in the same way as before.

CHAPTER 4

APPLICATION OF METHODOLOGY

My objective in this chapter will be to demonstrate the value of the methodology which I have developed by indicating how it would be applied to a particular example, *viz.*, the system of sorcery described by Carlos Castañeda in his account of his apprenticeship to Juan Matus, a Yaqui *brujo*.[37] This endeavour is not equivalent to the actual process involved in applying the methodology, but only shows how such a project might proceed. Each individual must perform the task for himself; this essay is no substitute for the concrete application of the methodology here described, although I hope it will provide helpful direction for such an undertaking.

I shall begin by elaborating some general considerations regarding my example. For the purpose of this enterprise, I will assume that Castañeda's account is a completely veridical autobiography. The outlandish nature of the experiences which he describes have prompted some scepticism concerning this point; however, this issue in no way endangers my thesis. The authenticity of the conceptual system to which we apply the methodology is irrelevant to the illustrative aspect of the

example. However, the weight of evidence strongly favours the judgment that the substance of Castañeda's reports is authentic. First, although zealous researchers have uncovered some apparent inconsistencies regarding Castañeda's version of his past life,[38] these incongruities are due to his avowed policy to create a "fog" around himself and to tell the "emotional truth" while leaving statistical data uncertain.

> "Carlos' basic explanation of his lying is both perfect and totally unresponsive. 'To ask me to verify my life by giving you my statistics,' he says, 'is like using science to validate sorcery. It robs the world of its magic and makes milestones out of us all.' In short, Castañeda lays claim to an absolute control over his identity." [39]

Second, though none have witnessed his experiences save don Juan, those closest to him, his supervisor and colleagues, have no doubt that his reports are factual. Furthermore, the circumstances surrounding the writing and publication of his first book constitute strong evidence that no hoax was ever intended. For example, there is no apparent motive for such elaborate subterfuge. His first book was submitted to a university press, an indication that he expected only limited circulation. Submitted as an M.A. thesis in ahthropology, it was accepted only after Castañeda was required to rewrite it twice (over

a period of three years). This prodigious effort makes the motive of achieving an easy degree by avoiding research highly unlikely. Lastly, the nature of his experience is no stranger than those described in some works which are unquestionably autobiographical.[40]

There is a special problem which arises from this example in that Castañeda is not merely a neutral observer, but is pursuing a course of instruction, and don Juan, in his capacity of instructor, is extremely pragmatic. Thus his methodology of instruction is not designed to explain his system to Castañeda in a simple, forthright manner. His emphasis is on action rather than talk, and he only uses explanation to further specific goals in teaching. We must therefore be on guard to distinguish bona fide elucidations of concepts in the system from apparent distortions and inconsistencies resulting from don Juan's technique.[41]

Within don Juan's system, the importance of understanding is minimal. The course which Castañeda undergoes is designed to totally remold him as a person, changing his beliefs, attitudes, behaviour, etc., and teach him various techniques for living in his altered world. But even though the force of don Juan's teachings is mainly non-cognitive, many fundamental philosophical issues, including my main thesis topic, are treated explicitly or implicitly in the process of Castañeda's

instruction. This is double-edged; it is both helpful in giving insight into the more interesting aspects of the system, and a hindrance by increasing the complexity and scope of what must be understood. In any case, it removes all doubt that we are here confrtoned by a total conceptual system.

I wished to use this example because the events described were to be understood according to a system of thought which most clearly contrasts with the common sense of a typical western man. At the outset, Castañeda exemplifies such an outlook. This case also has the feature of showing what roles culture and language may play with respect to the authentic adoption of a conceptual system. To someone learning how to become a sorcerer, the course is virtually independent of both factors.[42] Yet, in the individual variation in experiential content, there are references made to cultural determinants as well as individual differences due to temperament.

There are further advantages which prompted the selection of this particular alternate conceptual system. The original data of conversations between our reporter (Castañeda) and an original member of the conceptual system involved (don Juan) occurs in a language having familiar structure and vocabulary (i.e., Spanish); thus there is no problem of translation (an issue which need not be

discussed within the scope of this work); Spanish-English translation is relatively simple and well-known. There is a minimum of unexplained observations, and of these, none are due to language difficulty. The reports are made, Castañeda claims, in the phenomenological mode, which is appropriate, bearing in mind the bias involved due to one's native conceptual system.[43] He is also attempting to gain membership in this way of life and his commentary on his experiences and difficulty in accepting the interpretations given in that system provide insight into some of the problems of becoming a participant of the conceptual system which one wishes to understand. In this case, the outcome would be a complete and permanent change in how one experiences and understands the world.[44]

Let us now attempt to follow through the steps for the application of the proposed methodology with respect to don Juan's conceptual system. As we will discover later, there are certain limitations to this sort of demonstration; nevertheless, the endeavour should prove to be elucidatory. It is crucial to bear in mind that this example is designed to illustrate how such an application would proceed, not to apply the methodology in its entirety.

The primary source for commencing our inquiry into don Juan's system of sorcery is the verbatim accounts of his conversations with Castañeda. In order to place the central concepts of this system in the context of this background, I have selected quotations for each concept in the system, and formed Appendix A. For each entry, there will be at least one instance of its use, or an explanation of the concept itself in terms of the system. The problems of isolating concepts and determining which are central to the system are easily solved; for instance, short terms which indicate substantives (or are in substantival form), qualities, actions, or events may be assumed to refer to simple concepts. The emphasis on activities and processes, however, leads us to posit complex concepts which correspond to phrases. For example, 'becoming one with the ally', 'becoming a man of knowledge', etc., are complex concepts which illustrate the subjective orientation of the system toward personal change and development. Other complex concepts, which are non-reflexive, are 'creating power objects', 'piercing a sorcerer', and 'hunting power'.

(1), (a) and (b)

The overlap with respect to range of application is fairly extensive. Besides the wealth of shared concepts which, strictly speaking, are not a part of the

system, a good number of concepts which do play an important role in his system have equivalents or close approximations which we may easily comprehend since the range of application of these concepts is virtually identical in both systems. In these cases, it is primarily the role which such concepts play in each system that is of significance. A tentative list is provided here, although a more exhaustive list may be found in Appendix B, giving a catalogue of terms denoting concepts in don Juan's system, familiar analogues of these concepts (if possible), and a rough estimate of the degree of overlap between the range of application of these and familiar concepts. The concepts which have identical, or nearly identical ranges of application with a concept in our system (usually referred to by the same term) are as follows:

ABSOLUTE ASSURANCE
ALERT
ANGER
APPRENTICE
ATTACHMENT
BODY
COLOR
CONTROL
COURAGE
DECISION
DETACHMENT
DIRECTION
DIVINING
EXPLANATION
GATHERING PLANTS
LIFE
LIZARD
OLD AGE
OMEN
PATIENCE
PLANT
PREPARED
RESPECT
RESPONSIBILITY
ROUTINE
SELF-IMPORTANCE
STRATEGY
STRUGGLE
TALKING
THINKING
UNBENDING INTENT
WELL-BEING
WIDE AWAKE
WIND
WORLD OF ORDINARY MEN

It is important to note that overlap with respect to range of application need not indicate overlap with respect to role in the respective conceptual systems. Thus some concepts in this list will be virtually shared with respect to both, e.g., 'prepared'; others will have identical ranges of applications, but play diverse roles, e.g., 'divining.'

(1), (c)

A description of the role of these concepts in their native system is a profitable enterprise for the purpose of understanding the contents of the system's formal constants. From the discourse involving Carlos and don Juan, it is possible to come to a preliminary understanding, in the sense of being able to speak correctly in terms of the vocabulary and grammar which they employ in their discourse. Unfortunately, I am unable to present more than a brief description in Appendix D; however, along with the context of the original discourse provided in Appendix A, this should be sufficient to acquaint the reader with the system under study.

Appendix E will provide a list of terms (which appear in single quotations in Appendix C---a device I will use to indicate terms which correspond to concepts in don Juan's system) under the headings of the categories of my proposed classification. This classification is my

own and I do not claim it to be absolute; however, it seems to be fairly helpful from a didactic point of view, and some framework-bound classification may be inevitable in the application of any methodology.

(1), (d)

To exhaustively indicate the ways in which every concept in don Juan's system is analogous/disanalogous with a number of concepts in our system with respect to the role it plays would be beyond the point of diminishing returns, and thus no corresponding appendix is provided. It will be sufficient to take into account a few central examples. Let us consider the concept 'apprentice'. The role of 'apprentice' in don Juan's system is virtually identical to the role of "apprentice" in ours; similarly, 'benefactor' and "tutor" play closely analogous roles. The disanalogy is that in the system of sorcery, the 'apprentice' has no appreciable prior understanding of the nature of the 'knowledge' he is to 'learn'; this would be somewhat like enrolling in a course of study in our system with only the information that it would be designed to convert the student into a mystic. Also, there is no standardized course or period of instruction, although there are certain procedures which require rigid adherence in various activities. The 'apprenticeship' is only terminated at the point where

the 'apprentice' is able to proceed on his own, or succumbs irrevocably to one of the 'natural enemies'. In addition to this, the manner in which the 'benefactor' selects his 'apprentice' differs. In our system, it is usually the apprentice who selects his tutor, and is accepted not only on the basis of his capability but also on his ability to pay for the services; in don Juan's system, the 'benefactor' chooses his 'apprentice(s)' on the basis of an 'omen', and receives nothing in the way of material compensation. Don Juan merely asks of Castaneda, "Pay me for my time.....with your time."[45]

(2), Intelligibility

Of the activities, practices, experiences, etc., that are intelligible in don Juan's system, some are unintelligible to us; those which are immediately intelligible usually are so on the basis of our conceptual system in a manner which is incompatible with its intelligibility on the basis of don Juan's system. For example, Carlos experiences something with the aid of don Genaro which he finds unintelligible.

> "Don Genaro stood in front of me and began swinging his arms at his sides, back and forth in unison.
>
> 'Look, little Carlos,' he said. 'Look! Look!'

> He made an extraordinary sharp, swishing sound. It was the sound of something ripping. At the precise instant the sound happened, I felt a sensation of vacuity in my lower abdomen. It was the terribly anguishing sensation of falling, not painful, but rather unpleasant and consuming. It lasted a few seconds and then it subsided, leaving a strange itch in my knees. But while the sensation had lasted, I experienced another unbelievable phenomenon. I saw don Genaro on top of some mountains that were perhaps ten miles away. The perception lasted only a few seconds and it happened so unexpectedly that I did not have time really to examine it. I cannot recall whether I saw a man-size figure standing on top of the mountains, or a reduced image of don Genaro. Yet at that moment I was certain beyond any doubt that I was seeing him standing on top of the mountains. However, the moment I thought that I could not possibly see a man ten miles away the perception vanished.
>
> I turned around to look for don Genaro, but he was not there."46

Although don Juan declined to explain this experience to Castañeda, from analogous occurrences it would be probably explained as follows: don Genaro exercised his ability to 'bring about the world of sorcerers' by using his 'extra ring of power', 'opened Castañeda's gap', and 'moved' instantaneously to a distant mountain top. In our system, this is unintelligible.

On the other hand, other experiences appear intelligible in both systems. Seeing 'crows' flying or hearing their cawing is a commonplace experience which is easily intelligible in our system. In don Juan's system,

however, it is also intelligible, but more often as an event of great significance, as an omen.[47] Other events may be intelligible in both systems on the same basis; e.g., the employment of various techniques which a 'hunter' uses to construct traps, and his procedures for stalking game.

What we require is to make intelligible to us the contents of don Juan's concept of intelligibility in a manner which synthesizes the concepts of intelligibility of both systems. The explanations of experiences given in terms of don Juan's system will be intelligible once we have made intelligible the concepts which are used in such explanations. I shall provide the means for achieving an understanding of 'moving' in order to demonstrate how this should proceed.

'Moving' is a technique which has to be learned. The range of application of the concept is approximately equivalent to the instances where a brujo perceives or acts at a distance.

> "...a brujo can move a thousand miles in one second to see what is going on. He can deliver a blow to his enemies long distances away." [48]

By determining the relationship between the esoteric concept of 'moving' and the more familiar concepts of 'seeing

at a distance' and 'delivering a blow at a distance', we increase our understanding of the former. Both 'seeing at a distance' and 'delivering a blow at a distance' have almost the same form and content in our conceptual system as in don Juan's. They are disanalogous to the extent that (a) our system uses techniques which require scientific explanation, (b) what constitutes striking a blow will differ. We may conclude that 'moving' is loosely analogous to "projecting one's powers to perceive and have causal efficacy beyond their normal range."

First, the concept of 'moving' is at least now minimally intelligible to us. We know how to relate it to other terms in don Juan's system, and how to relate it to concepts in our system. But let us remember that this is but the first crude step in making the concept intelligible, and much more must be done before it becomes fully comprehensible.

Second, an understanding of this concept alone will be insufficient to make Castañeda's experience intelligible. For example, can the concept of 'moving' account for don Genaro's apparent physical disappearance (even in terms of don Juan's system)? The answer would seem to require that we understand each concept used in the explanation not only separately but in combination with the others.

Third, if we grant that we can make these concepts intelligible, what sort of tension arises in our system as a result, and how are we to resolve it? Certainly, 'moving' is a concept which seems incompatible with our notion of physical movement, which relies heavily on a Newtonian mechanistic view of the world. In order to make 'moving' intelligible in our system, we must restructure our conceptual category of "acting at a distance."

(3), Content

It is neither feasible nor necessary to provide an exhaustive analysis of the content of the other formal constants in don Juan's conceptual system: a selection of central examples will be sufficient for the purpose of illustration.

(a) Rationality

In don Juan's system, it is the ultimate in irrationality to attempt to 'become a man of knowledge' by recording conversations verbatim as Castañeda does. On the other hand, it is rational to 'meet with the ally' as often as possible until one 'becomes one with the ally' which involves the ingestion of 'power plants', all with the proper preparation and ritual. (For concepts which are used to describe other rational activities, cf. Appendix D, Sec. 5.)

(b) Actuality

According to don Juan, those things actually exist that can affect you or be affected by you. For example, when Castaneda asks if the 'guardian' is real, don Juan replies, "Of course it was real. It caused you pain, didn't it?" Thus in don Juan's system, a sufficient condition for an entity to be actual is the capacity to affect a person. For all practical purposes, this may also be regarded as a necessary condition. Yet, a particular individual's incapacity to be affected by an actual existent (e.g., by the 'guardian') may be explained by the notion of the 'shields' which we acquire in the process of being raised, and of which we are never aware.

(c) Ontology

The ontological status of entities in don Juan's system may be inferred from the way the corresponding concepts are used. For example, there are material objects like rocks, plants, etc., but these may alter status under certain conditions. Rocks may become 'power objects', 'strings', etc; plants may be 'power plants' like 'Mescalito'. (There is a blurred distinction between the plant, peyote, and the being one encounters when it is ingested, and thus the name "mescalito" is used for

both.) Other entities, like 'powers', the 'guardian', etc., are non-material, but nevertheless actual existents on the criteria of the system.

As we make the concepts in don Juan's system intelligible, and attempt to resolve the tension which results from this operation, tension will likely be produced with respect to the content of the other formal constants. The changes which our system must undergo in order to effect a resolution will be considerable in this case. Certain polarities in our conceptual system (e.g., subject-object, subjective-objective, physical-mental, etc.) which are central paradigms for our formal constants, must evolve in some manner during the ensuing conceptual revolution or be abandoned altogether. It is clear that they are insufficient to provide a basis for understanding don Juan's system in its widest sense, where these polarities have little application.

Let us take a simple case and roughly sketch out how this aspect of the methodology is to work in practice. In don Juan's system, it is rational to 'talk to plants'; one apologizes for picking them, thanks them for giving up their lives, etc. One 'talks to plants' in order to be on good terms with them; it is believed that they can recognize people and have the ability to affect them, either favorably or adversely (especially plants

which are used in sorcery). In our system, it would be considered irrational to talk to plants just as it would be to talk to stones or walls. In order to expand the content of our concept of rationality to encompass the activity of talking to plants, we might revise the ontological status of plants to encompass the concept of 'plant'; i.e., instead of grouping them with inanimate objects, which can neither perceive nor discriminate, we may consider them to be more or less on a par with the higher animals. (It isn't irrational to talk to your pet cat.)

The elaboration of how this methodology would be applied has necessarily been sketchy, since its complete successful execution would entail a vast alteration of our conceptual system. The extent of this would depend upon the remoteness of the system to which it was applied. In the case of don Juan's system, the necessary change is far-reaching.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

It is imperative that I now meet the possible objection that either the Absolutist or Relativist methodology may be equal to or superior to that which I have presented. I shall sketch out the philosophical positions of each and suggest how the respective methodolgoies would be formulated. By critically analyzing these positions, I hope to show my preference to be justified. The simple Absolutist and Relativist positions do not of themselves imply any particular methodology, but they engender attitudes which may lead to their respective radical extremes; these do imply certain methodologies. Neither position may be conclusively proven correct or incorrect, for each will appeal to its own criteria. Whether one position or the other is correct must remain moot. Each side presents arguments supporting opposite picture preferences, and I am engaged in presenting a picture preference for a third alternative.

The Absolutist position rests upon the presupposition that there are absolute criteria for intelligibility, rationality, reality, etc. The variations among people which we observe concerning the content of these concepts

is due to error; people are simply mistaken about what is intelligible, rational, real, etc. When there is disagreement, then at most, one party can be correct. Winch places Evans-Pritchard (though less so than his predecessors) in that camp, and considers the characterization of the Absolutist position (presented in Chapter 1) applicable to him.

> "Now although Evans-Pritchard goes a very great deal further than most of his predecessors in trying to present the sense of the institutions he is discussing as it presents itself to the Azande themselves, still, the last paragraph does, I believe, pretty fairly describe the attitude he himself took at the time of writing this book. There is more than one remark to the effect that 'obviously there are no witches'; and he writes of the difficulty he found, during his field work with the Azande, in shaking off the 'unreason' on which Zande life is based and returning to a clear view of how things really are. This attitude is not an unsophisticated one but is based on a philosophical position ably developed in a series of papers published in the 1930's..." 49

When faced with the task of distinguishing the intelligible from the unintelligible, the rational from the irrational, the real from the unreal, etc., the Absolutist will either assume that (a) his standards of intelligibility, rationality, etc., correspond to the ultimate standards, (b) that there is no way to have complete certainty as to which standards are absolute, but that his standards must be regarded as the best approxi-

mations until proven wrong, or (c) that his native conceptual system is unsatisfactory, and therefore attempts to construct a comprehensive world view. In practice, (b) and (c) reduce to (a).

The resulting methodology for understanding another conceptual system will be that of assimilation, the subsuming of all alien concepts under our presently understood conceptual categories. Our conceptual system will be regarded as the measure of the intelligibility of the alien concepts. The Absolutist considers his enterprise to be that of discovering which of the concepts in the other system <u>are</u> intelligible, and basing the conclusion upon the readiness with which it is assimilable. The primary consideration in this regard is the concept's range of application.

Furthermore, once the concepts of the other system have been assimilated in this manner, the entities to which they refer and the activities which they are used to describe will be judged on the basis of the status of the corresponding conceptual categories in our system under which they have been subsumed. That is, if 'the god of the volcano' refers to a concept found in the conceptual system of a Polynesian tribe, then it will be subsumed under the category of mythology, and the ontological status which the Absolutist will ascribe to

the entity to which it refers is mythological; also, the activity of 'making sacrifices to appease the god of the volcano' will be viewed as irrational because (it will be claimed) there are no reasonable grounds for believing that such actions will be causally efficacious.

The Relativist rejects the central presupposition of Absolutism, viz., that there are absolute criteria for intelligibility, rationality, reality, etc. He holds that the only criteria of intelligibility which have valid application to concepts of a particular conceptual system are those of the system in question. Similarly, what is real or rational is relative to the conceptual system which is employed in order to make sense of these entities and activities, primarily the system to which they are native. The contention that the intelligibility of a concept is system-dependent means that only a native of a conceptual system, an authentic participant of the form of life upon which it is based, is able to understand the concepts of that system.[50] An individual who does not share that system may only discover why these concepts are intelligible to a native; however, unless he actually adopts the system he wishes to study, he cannot make these concepts intelligible on the same grounds, and any other grounds for intelligibility are ruled out for a proper understanding.

From this position, the form which a Relativist methodology for understanding an alternate conceptual system must take is: In order to understand another conceptual system, one must become a participant of that system. In order to derive this conclusion, I attribute to the Relativist a further plausible assumption, that it is necessary to become a participant of a conceptual system in order to attain a participant's understanding of that system.

It is now opportune to appraise these conflicting positions and determine their relative merits and deficiencies. The glaring problem with Absolutism lies with actual and possible disagreement. If the tenet of ultimate standards is to be more than an empty article of faith, then the Absolutist is obliged to provide some means of resolving disputes. It is not enough to claim that at best, one of the disputants is right; we require some means for determining which one. However, any proposal for what constitutes ultimate criteria must be internally incorrigible, i.e., it cannot be criticized from within. When two such proposals conflict, neither may be proven wrong on the basis of its own criteria; similarly, external criticism is precluded, for neither position may allow a third perspective to arbitrate without thereby relinquishing its claim to ultimacy. The logical

result of this philosophical bind is the preservation of the status quo of the Absolutist's conceptual system, at the cost of regarding his opponents as simply wrong. This is not merely the result of a dogmatic attitude, but arises from the nature of the philosophical position which holds not only that there are ultimate criteria, but attempts to spell out what they are.

The attendant methodology is also subject to criticism. The Absolutist's attempt to understand a concept of another conceptual system ignores the role it plays in that system, and the relations it has to other concepts in that system. But worse than this, it ignores discrepancies between an alien concept's range of application and that of the familiar concept under which it is subsumed. The assimilation model overemphasizes the similarity between the content of these concepts and ignores important differences, thus resulting in misunderstanding.

For example, the Absolutist would likely purport to understand the Japanese concept of hara kiri simply as a (rather bizarre) means of committing suicide, on a par perhaps with slitting one's throat. But we have come to learn that the concept of hara kiri must be understood in relation to their concept of "losing face," a notion with which we are more familiar. According to Japanese

tradition, a person who has "lost face" due to an unjust act of another may rectify the situation by disemboweling himself at that person's front door; he "saves face," and causes the wrongdoer to "lose face," as the resulting gory mess is mute testimony that an injustice was committed and who was responsible. Thus, the difference between hara kiri and suicide (i.e., in terms of motivation and social significance) is much more important than the similarity (i.e., the taking of one's own life). Therefore, a straight-forward assimilation by equating hara kiri with suicide would result in a shallow over-simplification.

This methodology would also lead to a misunderstanding of the Zande concept of magic, for as Winch notes, it is an important point that our conceptual system does not originally have a category which corresponds to the Zande category of magic, just as it appears that the Azande have no categories of science and non-science.[51]

> "Since it is we who want to understand the Zande category, it appears that the onus is on us to expand our understanding so as to make room for the Zande category, rather than to insist on seeing it in terms of our own ready-made distinction between science and non-science. Certainly the sort of understanding we seek requires that we see the Zande category in relation to our own already understood categories. But this neither means that it is right to 'evaluate' magic in terms of criteria belonging to those other categories; nor does it give any clue as to which of our existing categories

> of thought will provide the best point of reference from which we can understand the point of the Zande practices." [52]

What Winch intends by claiming that we must see the category of Zande magic in relation to our own categories is not that we must equate it with one of them, nor does he imply that it can be satisfactorily understood without considering its relations to other concepts within that system. His argument is designed to dispel the plausibility of the Absolutist position, including the methodology of assimilation.[53]

I tend to accept the Relativist position, but maintain important reservations. The Relativist is correct in relating criteria for the contents of formal constants to respective conceptual systems, but confuses the issue by failing to distinguish various senses of 'understanding' and holding a narrow view of what constitutes understanding a different conceptual system. Even if we grant the assumption that in order to gain a participant's understanding of an alternate conceptual system, we must become participants of that system, it must be shown that a participant's understanding is the only "proper" understanding. However, this assumption too is open to debate. Kai Nielsen argues, with respect to the conceptual system upon which is based religious discourse, that we may achieve a participant's understanding while retaining

our own conceptual system.

> "I agree with such Wittgensteinians that to understand religious discourse one must have a participant's understanding of it. However, this certainly does not entail that one is actually a participant, that one accepts or believes in the religion in question." 54

At issue here is the extent to which one's understanding is limited by failure to have the relevant beliefs to which both concepts and experiences are related in the system. I think the solution will depend on the sort of understanding we wish to achieve.[55]

The critical fault in the Relativist methodology is the necessity of abandoning (or at least temporarily suspending) our conceptual system in order to adopt the system we wish to understand. At best, given their position this will be viewed as a trade, for the Relativist does not admit non-framework-bound criteria which would provide a basis for judging the merits of each system. It would seem that because of practical considerations, there would be little impetus for anyone to attempt this sort of "leap of faith." Thus, paradoxically, it appears that the effect of holding a Relativist position also has the effect of maintaining the status quo of an individual's conceptual system, not on theoretical grounds, but on pragmatic grounds; the cost of understanding another conceptual system is exhorbitant.

It should be clear by now that what constitutes understanding for the Absolutist and for the Relativist differ, and both differ from what is meant by "understanding" within the context of the methodology which I have outlined. Similarly, what is considered "satisfactory understanding" differs. For the Absolutist, in order for our understanding of another conceptual system to be satisfactory it must not disturb our system; the Relativist regards as satisfactory nothing less than the complete adoption of the system we wish to understand. (I do not include Winch as one who holds this extreme position.) I consider that it is minimally sufficient to understand that certain beliefs, practices, activities, etc., are intelligible, rational, etc., to those within the conceptual system we wish to study, and know the range of application of the relevant concepts of that system and the roles they play. Nevertheless, this sort of understanding has limited value. Ideally, we should expand this understanding to the fullest extent possible by completing the application of the proposed methodology in a dynamic asymmetric synthesis of the two systems. What was hitherto intelligible, rational, etc., in only one of the systems will be intelligible, rational, etc., in our resulting conceptual system.

A central question which must be raised is: If our conceptual system is to evolve, perhaps even undergoing a conceptual revolution, in what sense will the new system be ours?[56] For example, two individuals A and B share a conceptual system S; A applies my methodology to an alternate conceptual system C, and thereby his system changes into S'. According to the criteria for individuating conceptual systems which was set out in Chapter 2, the mere fact that there is a difference in content of formal constants of S and S' is not sufficient for the claim that A and B no longer share the same system. Whether or not we will say that their respective systems are the same will depend on the context, with the probability that the context will be of such a nature as to require that we regard A and B as having different systems dependent on the extent to which the content of the formal constants has expanded from S to S'.

Let us contrast this situation with those which would result from the application of the methodologies implicit in the other positions which we have considered. The Absolutist would require A to have conceptual system C both before and after the application of the Absolutist methodology. He would only have more "information" than B. The Relativist would have A adopt C by becoming a full participant of that system; as we have defined S

and C as alternate systems, A and B would no longer share the same system.

Within the wider context of don Juan's conceptual system, he attempts to reconcile the contrary contents of the concept of intelligibility of ordinary men, i.e., us and Castañeda (before his apprenticeship), and sorcerers (in the narrow sense) who cannot yet 'see'. This methodology for resolving conflict between conceptual systems can only be applied by dual participants, however.

> "'What stopped inside you yesterday was what people have been telling you the world is like. You see, people tell us from the time we are born that the world is such and such and so and so, and naturally we have no choice but to see the world the way people have been telling us it is.'
>
> We looked at each other.
>
> 'Yesterday the world became as sorcerers tell you it is,' he went on. 'In that world coyotes talk and so do deer, as I once told you, and so do rattlesnakes and trees and all other living beings. But what I want you to learn is seeing. Perhaps you know now that seeing happens only when one sneaks between the worlds, the world of ordinary people and the world of sorcerers. You are now smack in the middle point between the two. Yesterday you believed the coyote talked to you. Any sorcerer who doesn't see would believe the same, but one who sees knows that to believe that is to be pinned down in the realm of sorcerers. By the same token, not to believe that coyotes talk is to be pinned down in the realm of ordinary men.'

'Do you mean, don Juan, that neither the world of ordinary men nor the world of sorcerers is real?'

'They are real worlds. They could act upon you. For example, you could have asked that coyote about anything you wanted to know and it would have been compelled to give you an answer.'" [57]

Don Juan's methodology for resolving Castañeda's either/or dilemma may be generalized; if someone is a member of two incompatible conceptual systems, he is to resolve the conflict by adopting a third conceptual system within which the original systems are viewed as compatible. Thus if A becomes a dual participant of S and C, he may resolve the situation by adopting a third conceptual system K which shows S and C in a new light. My proposed methodology is closely similar to don Juan's, but differs in that A will have a participant's understanding of S but not of C; thus S' will differ from K. However, what happens in each case is essentially the same sort of thing.[58]

In conclusion, we have found the Absolutist methodology sterile. Don Juan's methodology is superior to that of the Relativist because it provides a favorable resolution to the tension created by the authentic adoption of two (or more) incompatible conceptual systems; the best solution the Relativist can provide is to ignore the inconsistencies by using only one system at a time while temporarily suspending the other (a series of Gestalt switches, back and forth, seeing the world first one

way, then the other). Both of these methodologies, however, require the authentic participation of the investigator in the form of life of the alternate system, a most impractical demand. On the other hand, although my preferred methodology involves altering our conceptual system, this occurs in a manner which preserves the ties with our original position (through an expansion rather than a rejection); the growth of our system will be the result of our taking into account a different conceptual system, but without the necessity of coming to adopt it. I conclude that of these alternatives, the methodology which I have selected is the only one which is both practical and valuable.

FOOTNOTES TO THESIS

1. Winch, P., "Understanding a Primitive Society," (UPS), pp. 9-10.

2. MacIntyre, A., "A Mistake About Causality in Social Science," Philosophy, Politics and Society (Second Series), Edited by Peter Laslett and W. G. Runciman, Oxford, 1962.

3. Nielsen, K., "Wittgensteinian Fideism," The Journal of the Royal Institute of Philosophy, Vol. XLII, No. 161, July 1967, pp. 191-209.

4. Hudson, W. D., "On Two Points Against Wittgensteinian Fideism," Philosophy, 165 (July 1968), 269-273.

5. UPS, p. 29-30.

6. Castañeda, C., The Teachings of Don Juan: A Yaqui Way of Knowledge, A Separate Reality, and Journey to Ixtlan.

   It has also been desirable to include rather extensive appendices in order to better illustrate the methodology.

7. Aune, B., "Rorty on Language and the World," November 1972, p. 7. "Conceptual system" and "conceptual framework" may be taken to be synonymous.

8. This presents the problem of the reality of theoretical entities.

9. The problem of detection of conceptual systems will not be relevant to my enterprise. To avoid the possible confusion between whether something constitutes a conceptual system and whether or not we can detect it through observation, let us just say that these formal requirements, dependent upon our conceptual system as they are, need not be detectable in all instances. Thus it is possible that some conceptual systems might exist which we could not

detect (however, "could not" here does not mean "logically could not"). Furthermore, we might be able to detect a conceptual system on formal grounds, and find no concept whose content was analogous to any of ours. However, I cannot imagine what this would be like.

10. It is probable that no two individuals share exactly the same content of their formal constants (e.g., those entities, and only those entities which one individual believes to exist would not be identical to those another individual believes to exist).

11. Tennessen, H., "Scientists in Vain Wants of World Views," p. 6-7.

12. It will be well to bear in mind the crucial point that in illustrating the relations between conceptual systems, we cannot set out our own system for viewing in equal perspective with others. There is a necessary asymmetry due to the necessity of operating from within some conceptual system or other, and the one within which we are operating has a unique status for us: It cannot be studied from a detached point of view because we are not able to detach ourselves. This in no way implies that we cannot expand or alter our conceptual system, and it is an essential feature of our concept of understanding that we are able to do so. However, we cannot take an external viewpoint on our entire conceptual system in order to determine what direction these changes should take. A moment's reflection should make this point appear incontrovertible. The importance of this factor is not readily apparent, but is not to be neglected, for our very concept of understanding is itself only intelligible in terms of our conceptual system. Thus we must be aware of our starting point, which determines not only our goals but the means at our command for achieving them.

13. In "The World Well Lost" (cf. APA symposium on The Possibility of Alternative Conceptual Frameworks, December 29, 1972), Rorty attempts to prove that there cannot be an alternate conceptual framework. His argument, however, relies on the assumption that conceptual frameworks are total, non-overlapping systems. This assumption is unwarranted.

14. It is best to leave open the question of whether or not the concepts in the area of overlap are the 'same concepts' in each system.

15. This presupposes that there are "things" independent of any conceptual system, having definable characteristics and identifiable independent of our conceptual apparatus. As we have claimed previously, this assumption is gratuitous.

16. Gamow, G., One, Two, Three....Infinity, (passim). New York, Viking Press, 1964.

17. It is facile to assume that "covering the same ground" or "working in the same way" mean the same thing in different conceptual systems. Fortunately, nothing serious is lost by refusing to assume this; overlap between conceptual systems will be seen as an asymmetrical relation. However, since our initial position vis-a-vis the Hottentot conceptual system (e.g.) is asymmetrical, this is merely an appropriate reflection of this state of affairs.

18. Brodbeck, M., "Meaning and Action," The Philosophy of Science, (Edited by P. H. Nidditch), p. 97.

19. Winch's primary orientation is toward understanding different cultures and societies. To the extent that members of a particular culture or society share the same conceptual system, his project will depend upon understanding their conceptual system. Conceptual systems need not be individuated on these bases, and thus the problem of understanding different conceptual systems is more fundamental. It will be useful, nevertheless, to determine the import of Winch's theory to this wider problem.

20. A general methodology must be equally applicable to all possible conceptual systems. This is not to deny the value of methodologies which have application to a great number of actual cases, insofar as they are regarded as heuristic devices.

21. UPS, p. 29.

22. This illustrates the form/content distinction with respect to concepts. Intelligibility is a formal constant of all conceptual systems, but the content of this concept will be unique in each system.

23. UPS, p. 29-30.

24. What it is for something to have a point may be elaborated teleologically. In this case, its range of application is wider than Winch implies, for it is proper to describe actions as having a point whether or not they conform to the rules or conventions of a form of life; all that is required is that they be seen by the agent to relate to the advancement toward some desired goal.

25. UPS., p. 36.

26. Winch uses the term 'limiting concept' to indicate a concept which gives shape to our understanding of our concept of human life.

27. UPS, p. 38.

28. UPS, p. 42.

29. Vico substitutes "religion" for "birth" in his trio of universal principles. (Vico, G., The New Science, tr. Fisch, et al. Ithaca: Cornall U Press, 1958.)

30. UPS, p. 37.

31. Ibid.

32. I take Winch's notion of central concepts to be those concepts in a system in terms of which most activities and practices may be explained, or appear to make sense when related in a particular way.

33. For example, if we were to come upon a tribe whose form of life was totally alien to us, it might be useful to assume that the concepts "birth", "death" and "sexual relations" held a central place in their conceptual system, and attempt to understand their activities by relating them to these concepts. However, other plausible assumptions might work equally well for this purpose.

34. "Identifying the Dominant Conceptual Categories in a Language," Language and Culture, edited H. Hoijer, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963).

35. The extention of our concept of 'intelligibility' may be viewed as the adoption of another concept of 'intelligibility'; however, it is best considered as an extention because everything which was 'intelligible' in our original system is still 'intelligible' as well as what was at first only 'intelligible' in the other system.

36. It may seem that my value judgment here concedes the issue to the Relativist, but this will be clarified in Chapter V.

37. This account may be found in his first three books, although further accounts are soon to be published.

38. Time, March 5, 1973, p. 42.

39. Ibid., p. 46.

40. For example, in The Center of the Cyclone, by John Lilly, and Be Here Now, by Baba Ram Dass (formerly Richard Alpert).

41. For example, don Juan's unexpected scream (Journey p. 197) which was intended to affect Castaneda's 'solidity', was explained as a means of scaring away unpleasant spirits.

42. Journey to Ixtlan, p. 8.

43. The phenomenological mode of reporting experience involves a conscious attempt to describe what appears to be the subject in the most basic terms available while deliberately avoiding interpretation. There is danger if it is not realized that this procedure is framework-bound, that the fundamental terms which are used to describe phenomena are basic only with respect to a particular conceptual system.

44. Don Juan's contention that the world itself changes will be best left until after one has applied the methodology (or served an apprenticeship similar to Castaneda's).

45. Castañeda, C., Journey to Ixtlan. New York: Simon and Shuster, 1972, p. 21.

46. Castañeda, C., A Separate Reality, New York: Simon and Shuster, 1971, pp. 313-4.

47. Castañeda, C., Journey to Ixtlan. New York: Simon and Shuster, 1972, pp. 38-9.

48. Castañeda, C., The Teachings of Don Juan, Los Angeles: U. of California Press, 1968, pp. 129-31.

49. UPS, p. 10.

50. Nielsen agrees with the importance of attaining a participant's understanding, which the Wittgensteinian Fideist have claimed:

> "Anthropologists for years have stressed, and rightly, that one cannot gain a deep understanding of the distinctive features of a tribe's culture without a participant's understanding of the way of life of that culture. Concepts cannot be adequately understood apart from a grasp of their function in the stream of life. If a man has no experience of religion, has never learned God-talk where the 'engine isn't idling', he will not have a deep understanding of religion."
>
> ("Wittgensteinian Fideism," p. 192)

51. Winch notes, however, that "Evans-Pritchard's account shows that they do have a fairly clear working distinction between the technical and the magical." (UPS, p. 33.)

52. UPS, p. 33.

53. The Absolutist would treat don Juan's system in much the same manner, using our categories of science and non-science as well as mythology, superstition and hallucination.

54. Op. cit., (2), p. 193.

55. Thus far we have not explicitly discussed the view of conceptual systems which regards them as static, even during our encounters with other systems. It is not enough to merely note that this is not factually accurate; what is required is to show that static models are theoretically unsatisfactory for the purpose of illustrating how we come to understand other conceptual systems. The process of understanding concepts which are not part of our conceptual system is dynamic and involves the restructuring of our system in order to accommodate the new concepts.

It is dangerous, though, to assume that the new concepts in our system which we create to correspond to concepts in another system are always (or even sometimes) identical to those concepts. Instead we should view them as functional equivalents, having at best an identical range of application and a similar function.

56. How does an agent understand concepts within his own conceptual system through time? Because forms of life are dynamic, the range of application of a concept and its role in the system normally undergo continuous change. Eventually, we may find that a concept has undergone such a sweeping evolution that the present concept and its ancestor are best regarded as different concepts. In a trivial sense, any two ranges of application which are not strictly co-extensive indicate two different concepts. However, this is a criterion with little practical value for most concepts. There is no determinate means for deciding at which point the new concept was born; since the evolutionary process is gradual, any such decision will appear to be arbitrary. Similarly, when our entire system has changed to a sufficient extent, it will be appropriate to regard the system itself as different. We may only regard them as different systems in a sense importantly unlike the sense in which another contemporary system is different from ours. In the former case, we can understand our previous system by tracing the evolutionary process.

However, the evolution of a conceptual system cannot account for all possible kinds of change.

When for some reason a conceptual system becomes unsatisfactory, i.e., it cannot account for certain phenomena which are important to a form of life, it is subject to a crisis which is not soluble by merely extending the range of application of existing concepts, or similar means. What is required is a conceptual revolution which will restructure the critical domain in such a manner as to resolve the tension. This may require the creation of new conceptual categories, the invention of new epistemological models, etc.

57. Castañeda, Journey, pp. 299-300.

58. There is striking resemblance to the metaprogrammatic steps which John Lilly sets out for the exploration of "inner space" (The Center of the Cyclone, pp. 218-9), especially the principle that a new model must be constructed which includes both the current consensus reality and the new reality which has been experienced.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Books)

Castaneda, C. The Teachings of Don Juan. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968.

----------. A Separate Reality. New York: Simon and Shuster, 1971.

----------. Journey to Ixtlan. New York: Simon and Shuster, 1972.

Gamow, G. One, Two, Three..,Infinity (passim). New York: Viking Press, 1964.

Hamlyn, D. W. The Theory of Knowledge. Garden City, New York, Doubleday & Company, 1970.

Hoijer, H., (Editor). Language in Culture. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

Kuhn, T. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Korner, S. Categorical Frameworks. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970.

Lilly, J. The Center of the Cyclone. New York: Julien Press, 1972.

---------. Programming and Metaprogramming in the Human Biocomputer. New York: Julien Press, 1972.

Pearce, J. C. The Crack in the Cosmic Egg. Richmond Hill Ontario: Pocket Books, 1973.

Ram Dass, B. Be Here Now. New York: Crown Publishing, 1971.

Toulmin, S. The Philosophy of Science. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

Weil, A. The Natural Mind. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972.

Whorf, B. L. Language, Thought and Reality. Cambridge: Technology Press of M.I.T., 1956.

Wittgenstein, L. The Blue and Brown Books. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Wittgenstein, L. On Certainty. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1969.

----------. Philosophical Investigations. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968.

----------. Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963.

(Articles)

Aune, B. "Rorty on Language and the World," Journal of Philosophy, 69 (1972), 665-667.

Brodbeck, M. "Meaning and Action." Philosophy of Science. Edited P. Nidditch. London: Oxford U. Press, 1968.

Feyerabend, P. "How to be a Good Empiricist," Philosophy of Science. Edited P. Nidditch. London: Oxford U. Press, 1968.

Hacking, I. "A Language Without Particulars," Mind, 306, (April 1968), 168-185.

Harris, T. G., and Tavris, C. "No Turn Unstoned." Psychology Today, October, 1972, pp. 47-48.

Hudson, W. D. "On Two Points Against Wittgensteinian Fideism," Philosophy, 165 (July 1968), 269-273.

Keen, S. "Sorcerer's Apprentice." Psychology Today, December, 1972, pp. 90-102.

Nalven, J.G. "What is Yaqui in A Yaqui Way of Knowledge?" The New Scholar, 3 (1972), 6-33.

MacIntyre, A. "A Mistake About Causality in Social Science." Philosophy, Politics and Society. Edited by P. Laslett and W. G. Runciman. Oxford: 1962.

Nielsen, K. "Wittgensteinian Fideism," Philosophy, 161 (July, 1967), 191-209.

----------. "Wittgensteinian Fideism Again: A Reply to Hudson," Philosophy, 167 (January, 1969), 63-65.

Quine, W. V. O. "Ontological Relativity," Journal of Philosophy, 65 (1968), 185-212.

Rorty, R. "The World Well-Lost," Journal of Philosophy, 69 (1972), 649-665.

Winch, P. "Understanding a Primitive Society," American Philosophical Quarterly, 4 (October, 1964), 307-324.

Don Juan and the Sorcerer's Apprentice. Time Magazine, March 5, 1973, pp. 42-47.

The Sorcerer's Apprentice---Conversations with Carlos Castaneda, interview published in Penthouse Magazine, December 1972.

Tennessen, H. "Are There Different Truth Concepts?". (unpublished article).

----------. "Which World is the Real One and How Would We Ever Know?" (unpublished article).

----------. "Scientists in Vain Wants of World Views," (unpublished article).

----------. "Against Ideas of an Evolutionary Epistemology," (unpublished article).

Wisdom, J. "Explanations and Proof," (unpublished article).

APPENDIX A

CONCEPTS IN DON JUAN'S CONCEPTUAL SYSTEM IN CONTEXT OF CASTAÑEDA'S WRITINGS

ABANDON---
See MOOD OF A WARRIOR.

ABANDON ONESELF---
"The spirit is a force,...and as such, it responds only to strength. You cannot indulge in its presence....You abandoned yourself. You willed to abandon yourself. That was wrong....At times you really have no control and the forces of your life take you freely.....He maintained that for a warrior there was nothing out of control." [1]

ABSOLUTE ASSURANCE---
See MOOD OF A WARRIOR.

ACCESSIBLE---
He had used the Spanish idioms "ponerse al aleance" and "ponerse en el camino," to put oneself within reach....in the middle of a trafficked way.[2] "To worry is to become accessible, unwittingly accessible."[3] "...a warrior is never available; never is he standing on the road waiting to be clobbered."[4]

ACTION---
He said that the only thing that counted was action, acting instead of talking[5]...."let each one of your acts be your last battle on earth. Only under those conditions will your acts have their rightful power."[6]

AGREEMENT FROM THE WORLD---
"A man can get agreement from everything around him."[7]...."What you saw was not an agreement from the world....Crows flying or cawing are never an agreement. That was an omen!"[8]

AID---
"...an ally is the indispensible aid to knowing.[9]
"Power plants are only an aid." [10]

ALLY---

(Also: The Ally Carrying a Man Outside Himself; The Ally Furthering A Man's Knowledge; The Ally Advising A Man; The Ally Giving Strength; The Ally Guiding a Man's Acts.) (Cf. LITTLE SMOKE.)

"An ally is a power a man can bring into his life to help him, advise him, and give him the strength necessary to perform acts, whether big or small, right or wrong. This ally is necessary to enhance a man's life, guide his acts and further his knowledge." "An ally will make you see and understand things about which no human being could possibly enlighten you." "An ally is a power capable of carrying a man beyond the boundaries of himself. This is how an ally can reveal matters no human being could."[11] "The ally is not in the smoke... The smoke takes you to where the ally is, and when you become one with the ally you don't ever have to smoke again. From then on you can summon your ally at will and make him do anything you want."[12] "...you cannot see an ally. The allies take different forms. They look just like dogs, birds, even tumbleweeds, or anything else. The only difference is that when you see them they look just like what they're pretending to be. Everything has its own way of being when you see...but the allies can be seen only in the form they are portraying."[13] "To meet with an ally a man must be a spotless warrior or the ally may turn against him and destroy him."[14]

THE ALLY GIVING POWER---

See SPIRIT.

THE ALLY REMOVING ONE'S BODY---

See LITTLE SMOKE.

APPRENTICE---

"Mescalito actually played with you. That...was an indication [omen]...He means you were the 'chosen man' [escogido].....There are some secrets... I won't be able to reveal to anyone unless I find my chosen man....I've made up my mind and I am going to teach you the secrets that make up the lot of a man of knowledge."[15]

BATTLE---

See BATTLE OF POWER, PIERCING A SORCERER, WARRIOR.

BATTLE OF POWER---
"You had an encounter with power. The fog, the darkness, the lightning, the thunder and the rain were all part of a great battle of power. You had the luck of a fool. A warrior would give anything to have such a battle."[16]

BECOMING ACCESSIBLE TO POWER---
See POWER.

BECOMING ONE WITH THE ALLY---
See ALLY, LITTLE SMOKE.

BECOMING A MAN OF KNOWLEDGE---
See MAN OF KNOWLEDGE.

BEING IN PERFECT BALANCE WITH EVERYTHING---
See HUNTER, TRICK.

BENEFACTOR---[17]
"The art of a benefactor is to take us to the brink. A benefactor can only point the way and trick."[18]

BODY---
See LEARNING, NOT-DOING.

BRING ABOUT THE WORLD OF SORCERERS---
See RING OF POWER.

BRUJO---
The Spanish word brujo means, in English, medicine man, curer, witch, sorcerer. It connotes essentially a person who has extraordinary, and usually evil, powers.[19]

CHANGES---
(3 senses):"The change I'm talking about never takes place by degrees; it happens suddenly. And you are not preparing yourself for that sudden act that will bring a total change."[20] "I don't know what to change or why to change anything in my fellow man... I'm not trying to change you. It may happen that one day you may become a man of knowledge....but that will not change you. Some day perhaps you'll be able to see men in another mode and then you'll realize that there's no way to change anything about them."[21]

CHOOSING AN APPRENTICE---
See APPRENTICE.

CLARITY---
See FOUR NATURAL ENEMIES.

COLOR---
"...the colors I had seen in association with each specific spot had the same overall effect either of giving strength or curtailing it."[22]

CONTROL---
See CONTROLLED FOLLY, MOOD OF A WARRIOR.

CONTROLLED FOLLY---
"It's possible to insist, to properly insist, even though we know that what we're doing is useless... But we must know first that our acts are useless and yet we must proceed as if we didn't know it. That's a sorcerer's controlled folly."[23] "Because I have tempered my will throughout my life until it's neat and wholesome and now it doesn't matter to me that nothing matters. My will controls the folly of my life".[24] "My laughter, as well as everything I do, is real...but it is also controlled folly because it is useless; it changes nothing and yet I still do it."[25] "...a man who sees controls his folly, while his fellow man can't."[26]

COURAGE---
"Men of courage are dependable men, noble men perennially surrounded by people who flock around them and admire them; yet very few men of courage have will. Usually they are fearless men who are given to performing daring common-sense acts; most of the time a courageous man is also fearsome and feared. Will, on the other hand, has to do with astonishing feats that defy our common sense."[27]

CREATING POWER OBJECTS---
See POWER OBJECTS.

CROW---
See AGREEMENT FROM THE WORLD, EMISSARIES, PLACE OF POWER.

DEATH---
"Death is our eternal companion...always to our left at an arm's length."[28] "Death is not like a person. It is rather a presence....the manner in which a warrior sees his death is a personal matter."[29] "Death enters through the belly...through the gap of the will."[30] "The thing to do when you're im-

patient....is to turn to your left and ask advice from your death."[31] "Death is stalking me. Therefore I have no room for doubts or remorse...only time for decisions....In a world where death is the hunter there are no small or big decisions. There are only decisions that we make in the face of our inevitable death."[32] "Death is always waiting,... thus to venture into the unknown without power is stupid. One will only find death."[33] "It does not take much to die, and to seek death is to seek nothing."[34] "I don't understand why these people [Tibetan Book of the Dead] talk about death as if death were like life."[35]

DECISION---
See DEATH.

DETACHMENT---
"...the next thing one needs to be a warrior is detachment. The idea of imminent death, instead of becoming an obsession, becomes an indifference ....Only the idea of death makes a man sufficiently detached so he is incapable of abandoning himself to anything....so he can't deny himself anything... A detached man, who knows he has no possibility of fencing off his death, has only one thing to back himself with: the power of his decisions."[36]

DETECT MESSAGES---
See HOLES [IN SOUND].

DEVIL'S WEED---
"The devil's weed was my benefactor's ally....To tame the devil's weed into an ally is one of the most difficult tasks I know."[37] "The weed is used only for power."[38] "When one arrives to a depth of four yards...one finds the seat of permanent power, power without end."[39]

DIABLERO---
"...diablero is a term used only by the Sonoran Indians. It refers to an evil person who practices black sorcery and is capable of transforming himself into an animal---a bird, a dog, a coyote, or any other creature....A diablero, they say, is a brujo who changes into any form he wants to adopt."[40]

DIRECTION---
"...your death will point to the south. To the vastness."[41] "...to regain my strength I had to lie with my head towards the east."[42] "If the

lizard moves toward you (south), you cannot expect more than ordinary good luck; but if she moves away from you (north), the sorcery will be terribly difficult. You may even die!" 43

DIVINING---
See MOVING.

DOING---
"Doing is what makes that rock a rock and that bush a bush. Doing is what makes you yourself and me myself....That rock is a rock because of all the things you know how to do to it....I call that doing.....The world is the world because you know the doing involved in making it so....If you didn't know its doing, the world would be different." 44

DREAMING---
"Dreaming is real for a warrior because in it he can act deliberately, he can choose and reject, he can select from a variety of items those which lead to power, and then he can manipulate them and use them, while in an ordinary dream he cannot act deliberately."45 "...to 'set up dreaming' meant to have a concise and pragmatic control over the general situation of a dream, comparable to the control one has over any choice in the desert... Dreaming is real when one has succeeded in bringing everything into focus. Then there is no difference between what you do when you sleep and what you do when you are not sleeping."46 "...dreaming is the not-doing of dreams..."47

EMISSARIES---
"...they are the emissaries of your fate...From now on the crows will tell you with their flight about every turn of your fate."48 [The last emissaries will come at the same time of day in the same direction as an indication that your time is up.]

ENGAGE A WORTHY OPPONENT---
See WORTHY OPPONENT.

EXPLANATION---
"...explanations were not necessary....the only thing that counted was action, acting, instead of talking."49 "You have an insidious tendency. You persist in trying to explain everything to your satisfaction."50

"....you indulge yourself in trying to explain everything. Explanations are no longer necessary in your case."[51] "You insist on explaining everything as if the whole world were composed of things that can be explained...only a few things in this world can be explained your way....A phoney sorcerer tries to explain everything in the world with explanations he is not sure about...and so everything is witchcraft...You also want to explain everything your way but you're not sure of your explanations either."[52] "There are certain things I just know....I can't tell you how though."[53]

FEAR---

See MOOD OF A WARRIOR, FOUR NATURAL ENEMIES.

FEELING---

(Also: Feeling The Lines of the World, Feeling the World) See LINES OF THE WORLD.
The general pattern was that I had to "feel" all the possible spots that were accessible to me until I could determine without a doubt which was the right one.[54] "...the exercise of not-doing... would help anyone feel a line that came out from the moving hand, a line that one could place or cast wherever one wanted to....you can feel them. The most difficult part about the warrior's way is to realize that the world is a feeling. When one is not-doing, one is feeling the world, and one feels the world through its lines."[55]

FINDING A SPOT---

See FEELING, SPOT.

FLYING---

"The second portion of the devil's weed is used to fly...The trouble with you is that you understand things only in one way. You don't think a man flies; and yet a brujo can move a thousand miles in one second to see what is going on. He can deliver a blow to his enemies long distances away. So, does he or doesn't he fly?"[56]

FIBERS (OF LIGHT)---

"Men look different when you see. The little smoke will help you to see men as fibers of light...Fibers like white cobwebs. Very fine threats that circulate from the head to the naval. Thus a man looks like an egg of circulating fibers. His arms and legs are like luminous bristles, bursting out in

all directions...every man is in touch with everything else, not through his hands, though, but through a bunch of long fibers that shoot out from the center of his abdomen. Those fibers join a man to his surroundings; they keep his balance; they give him stability...a man is a luminous egg."[57]

FOLLOWING THE RULE---
See RULE.

FORCE---
"The spirit is a force..."[58] "He described will as a force...What a sorcerer calls force comes from within and attaches itself to the world out there."[59]

FORCES GUIDING MEN'S LIVES---
See HUNTER.

GAP---
"There is a gap in us...this gap opens as one develops one's will."[60] "Death enters through the belly...Right through the gap of the will."[61] "Your will is already opening your gap, little by little."[62]

GETTING INTO THE OTHER WORLD---
See OTHER WORLD.

GRABBING ONTO SOMETHING WITH ONE'S WILL---
See PERCEIVING THE WORLD, WILL.

GREEN FOG---
[One perceives this as one gazes into the water with the aid of the little smoke, as it is unavoidably there, like the guardian.]

GUARDIAN---
"Of course it was real. It caused you pain, didn't it?"[63] "If you want to see you must overcome the guardian."[64] "You cannot will the guardian to disappear. Your will can stop it from harming you though...You can actually go past the guardian and there's nothing that it can do."[65] "That's one way a brujo gets to see...You could see without it [smoking the mixture]...If you try to see the guardian without the aid of the smoke, chances are you may delay in getting out of its way...the guardian is not something you can fool around with."[66] "You never really saw the guardian...It doesn't matter whether you like or dislike the guardian.

As long as you have a feeling toward it the guardian will remain the same...If you have no feeling toward it...the guardian will become nothing and will still be there in front of you...as long as it was something you knew you did not see it."[67]

HANDLE---
See SPIRIT, UNDERSTANDING.

HAVING FEELINGS TOWARD THE GUARDIAN---
See GUARDIAN.

HELPER---
"...a helper is the aid of a diablero. A helper is a spirit that lives on the other side of the world, and helps a diablero cause sickness and pain. It helps him to kill."[68]

HOLES (IN SOUND)---
"I could not count all the whistles of birds or buzzings of insects, yet I was convinced I was listening to each separate sound as it was produced. Together they created a most extraordinary order. I cannot call it any other thing but 'order'. It was an order of sounds that had a pattern; that is, every sound happened in sequence ...The pattern of noises had spaces in between the sounds...the timing of each sound was a unit in the overall pattern of sound. Thus the spaces or pauses in between sounds were...holes in a structure."[69]

HUNTER---
(Also: Hunting, Hunting Power.)
See PLACE OF PREDILECTION, POWER, STOPPING THE WORLD.
"To be a hunter means that one knows a great deal... It means that one can see the world in different ways. In order to be a hunter one must be in perfect balance with everything else...A hunter leaves very little to chance...Hunters must be exceptionally tight individuals."[70] "A hunter must live as a hunter in order to draw the most out of his life... A hunter...must know that there are powers on this earth that guide men and animals and everything that is living."[71]

IMPECCABLE---
See WARRIOR, TRUST IN ONE'S PERSONAL POWER.

INACCESSIBLE---
"The art of a hunter is to become inaccessible...

To be unavailable means that you deliberately avoid exhausting yourself and others...to be inaccessible doesn't mean to hide or to be secretive...It doesn't mean that you cannot deal with people either...A hunter deals intimately with his world and yet he is inaccessible to that same world....He is inaccessible because he's not squeezing his world out of shape. He taps it lightly, stays for as long as he needs to, and then swiftly moves away leaving hardly a mark."[72]

INDICATION---
See OMEN.
"Mescalito actually played with you. That baffled me, because it was an indication [omen]."[73] "What you saw was...an omen!...A very important indication about you."[74]

INDULGENCE---
"The indulgence of denying [yourself] is by far the worst; it forces us to believe we are doing great things when in effect we are only fixed within ourselves."[75] "To be a hermit is an indulgence..."[76] "There are no diseases...only indulging. And you indulge yourself in trying to explain everything."[77] "Carlos is indulging in his confusion."[78]

INSTRUMENT---
"....maiz-pinto is merely an instrument, not an ally....Maiz-pinto, crystals, and feathers are mere toys in comparison with an ally."[79]

KEEPER---
See OTHER WORLD.

KEY JOINT---
"Sorcery is to apply one's will to a key joint... I mean your car is the spark plugs. That's a key joint for me. I can apply my will to it and your car won't work."[80]

KNOWLEDGE---
See LEARNING.

LEARNING---
(Also: Learning How To Become a Crow.)
See CROW: LEARNING HOW TO MOVE, MOVING, LEARNING HOW TO SEE, SEEING.
"There is only one way to learn, and that way is to get down to business. To only talk about power

is useless. If you want to know what power is, and if you want to store it, you must tackle everything yourself."[81] "...learning through conversation was not only a waste, but stupidity, because learning was the most difficult task a man could undertake...the limits of his learning are determined by his own nature...certain kinds of knowledge were too powerful for the strength I had, and to talk about them would only bring harm to me...no matter how frightening learning is, it is more terrible to think of a man without an ally, or without knowledge...knowledge was indeed power."[82] "Man lives only to learn. And if he learns it is because that is the nature of his lot, for good or bad."[83] "Our lot as men is to learn and one goes to knowledge as one goes to war."[84] "We are men and our lot is to learn and to be hurled into inconceivable new worlds."[85] "...you will learn in spite of yourself; that's the rule."[86] "...your body has learned certain things, even against your desire...your body now needs to come back to me and learn more."[87] "Learning is never what one expects. Every step of learning is a new task..."[88]

LINES OF THE WORLD---

"Whenever your hand remains warm you can actually feel the lines of the world with it...there were infinite numbers of lines that joined us to things ...he was trying to make me feel the lines of the world with his eyes."[89] "The sun was almost over the horizon. I was looking directly into it and then I saw the 'lines of the world.' I actually perceived the most extraordinary profusion of fluorescent white lines which criss-crossed everything around me."[90]

LITTLE SMOKE---

"...because the smoke is my ally I don't need to smoke anymore. I can call him anytime, anyplace... I mean I go to him freely."[91] "My ally is the little smoke, but that does not mean that my ally is in the smoking mixture, or in the mushrooms, or in my pipe. They all have to be put together to get me to the ally, and that ally I call little smoke for reasons of my own...The ally is not in the smoke...The smoke takes you to where the ally is, and when you become one with the ally you don't ever have to smoke again. From then on you can summon your ally at will and make him do anything you want."[92] "The little smoke removes the body and one is free...with the aid of the little smoke one cannot be stopped or locked in."[93]

LIZARD---
See DIRECTION.

MAKING SOMEONE SOLID---
See SOLID.

MAKING A SPIRIT CATCHER---
See SPIRIT CATCHER.

MAN OF KNOWLEDGE---
"A man of knowledge is one who has followed truthfully the hardships of learning...one who has, without rushing or faltering, gone as far as he can in unraveling the secrets of power and knowledge...He must challenge and defeat his four natural enemies...A man can call himself a man of knowledge only if he is capable of defeating all four of them....To be a man of knowledge has no permanence. One is never a man of knowledge, not really. Rather, one becomes a man of knowledge for a very brief instant, after defeating the four natural enemies."[94] "...only a crackpot would undertake the task of becoming a man of knowledge of his own accord. A sober-headed man has to be tricked into doing it."[95] "...a man of knowledge lives by acting, not by thinking about acting, nor by thinking about what he will think when he has finished acting. A man of knowledge chooses a path with heart and follows it; and then he looks and rejoices and laughs; and then he sees and knows. He knows that his life will be over all too soon; he knows that he, as well as everybody else, is not going anywhere; he knows, because he sees, that nothing is more important than anything else. In other words, a man of knowledge has no honor, no dignity, no family, no name, no country, but only life to be lived, and under these circumstances his only tie to his fellow men is his controlled folly."[96] "In order to become a man of knowledge one must be a warrior..."[97] "Any warrior could become a man of knowledge...a warrior is an impeccable hunter that hunts power. If he succeeds in his hunting he can be a man of knowledge."[98]

MEETING WITH AN ALLY---
See ALLY, WARRIOR.

MESCALITO---
"It was not a dog!...This is the only way to understand it. It's the only way! It was 'he' who played with you....Mescalito actually played with

you...it was an indication...Mescalito pointed you out to me and by doing that he told me you were the chosen man."[99] "He is just a protector and a teacher. He is a power....not the same for everybody... There are no common forms...He appears in any form to those who know him only a little, but to those who know him well, he is always constant...He appears,...as a man, like us, or as a light."[100] "At that moment I felt a great surge of wisdom engulfing me. A conjecture I had played with for three years turned then into a certainty...whatever is contained in the cactus Lophophora williamsii had nothing to do with me in order to exist as an entity; it existed by itself out there, at large. I knew it then."[102]

MOOD OF A WARRIOR---

"The little crow pointed out that specific spot to me, and at that spot I saw the opportunity of making you understand how one acts while one is in the mood of a warrior...Everything you did last night was done in a proper mood...You had a degree of abandon, and at the same time you had a degree of control over yourself...To climb that wall in darkness required that you had to hold on to yourself and let go of yourself at the same time. That's what I call the mood of a warrior...You can spur yourself beyond your limits if you are in the proper mood. A warrior makes his own mood...It's convenient to always act in such a mood...It cuts through the crap and leaves one purified...One needs the mood of a warrior in every single act...To achieve the mood of a warrior is not a simple matter. It is a revolution."[103] "A man goes to knowledge as he goes to war, wide awake, with fear, with respect, and with absolute assurance."[104] "...the nature of one's acts was unimportant as long as one acted as a warrior."[105] "The hardest thing in the world is to assume the mood of a warrior."[106]

MOVING---

"...a brujo can move a thousand miles in one second to see what is going on."[107] "...don Juan ordered me to return to the fog and asked me to pay strict attention to his voice because he was going to guide me so I could learn how to move; he said that once I saw the bubbles I should board one of them and let it carry me."[108] "You did very well...Today you learned that a brujo uses the water to move...not really learned how to move using the water, but I had learned that a brujo could do that, and that he

had deliberately told me to look at the bank of the stream so I could check my movement."[109]

NAMES---

"...there were other names for the devil's weed, but they were not to be used, because the calling of a name was a serious matter, especially if one is learning to tame an ally power...names were reserved to be used only when one was calling for help, in moments of great stress and need, and... such moments happen sooner or later in the life of whoever seeks knowledge."[110]

NATURAL ENEMIES---

"Fear! A terrible enemy---treacherous, and difficult to overcome...He must be fully afraid, and yet he must not stop. That is the rule!....It happens little by little, and yet the fear is vanquished suddenly and fast...he has acquired clarity---a clarity of mind which erases fear...Clarity! That clarity of mind, which is so hard to obtain, dispels fear, but also blinds...It forces the man to never doubt himself...he must defy his clarity and use it only to see, and wait patiently and measure carefully before taking new steps;...he will arrive at a position where nothing can harm him any more... It will be true power...Power! Power is the strongest of all enemies...He commands; he begins by taking calculated risks, and ends in making rules, because he is master...He has come to realize the power he has seemingly conquered is in reality never his...If he can see that clarity and power, without control over himself are worse than a mistake, he will reach a point where everything is held in check...and, almost without warning he will come upon the last of his enemies: Old age! This enemy is the cruelest of all, the one he won't be able to defeat completely, but only fight away... But if a man sloughs off his tiredness and lives his fate through, he can then be called a man of knowledge, if only for the brief moment when he succeeds in fighting off his last, invincible enemy. That moment of clarity, power, and knowledge is enough."[111]

NOT-DOING---

"...to not do what I knew how to do was the key to power."[112] "I am going to tell you about something that is very simple but very difficult to perform; I am going to talk to you about <u>not-doing</u>, in spite of the fact that there is no way <u>to talk</u>

about it, because it is the body that does it... Not-doing is so difficult and so powerful that you should not mention it...until you have stopped the world..."[113] "A warrior always tries to affect the force of doing by changing it into not-doing."[114] "Not-doing is very simple but very difficult....It is not a matter of understanding it but of mastering it."[115] "Shadows are like doors, the doors of not-doing."[116] "Everything I have taught you so far has been an aspect of not-doing...A warrior applies not-doing to everything in the world...You must let your own body discover the power and the feeling of not-doing."[117]

OMEN---

"...what we were doing was not a test, that we were waiting for an omen, and if the omen did not come the conclusion would be that I had not succeeded in hunting power, in which case I would be free from any further imposition, free to be as stupid as I wanted."[118]

OPENING ONE'S GAP---

See GAP.

OTHER WORLD---

"The particular thing to learn is how to get to the crack between the worlds and how to enter the other world. There is a crack between the two worlds, the world of diableros and the world of living men. There is a place where the two worlds overlap. The crack is there."[119] "You'll have to smoke my mixture...Then the keeper of the other world will come...It guards the other world...It's not the world of the dead or the world of anything. It's just another world. There's no use telling you about it. See it for yourself."[120] "Each of these six remaining points is a world, just like feeling and understanding are two worlds for you..."[121]

OVERCOMING THE GUARDIAN---

See GUARDIAN.

PATH OF KNOWLEDGE---

"The road of knowledge and power is very difficult and very long."[122] "Seek and see the marvels all around you."[123] "'Why did you stay away, don Juan?' 'For the same reason you did. I didn't like it.' 'Why did you come back?' 'For the same reason you have come back yourself, because there is no other way to live.'" [124] "Only as a warrior can one survive the path of knowledge...Because the art of a warrior is to balance the terror of being a man with the wonder of being a man."[125]

PATH WITH HEART---

"Anything is one of a million paths..[un camino entre cantidades de caminos]...Therefore you must always keep in mind that a path is only a path; if you feel you should not follow it you must not stay with it under any conditions...Look at every path closely and deliberately. Try it as many times as you think necessary. Then ask yourself, and yourself alone, one question: Does this path have a heart? All paths are the same: they lead nowhere...but one has a heart, the other doesn't... One makes you strong, the other weakens you." 126 "Before you embark on it you ask the question: Does this path have a heart? If the answer is no, you will know it, and then you must choose another path ...Anybody would know that. The trouble is nobody asks the question...A path without a heart is never enjoyable. You have to work hard even to take it. On the other hand, a path with heart is easy; it does not make you work at liking it."127 "...a man who only traverses the paths of life is everything. Today I am neither a warrior nor a diablero. For me there is only the travelling on the paths that have a heart, on any path that may have a heart. There I travel, and the only worthwhile challenge for me is to traverse its full length. And there I travel---looking, looking, breathlessly."128 "...in his day-to-day life a warrior chooses to follow the path with heart. It is the consistent choice of the path with heart which makes a warrior different from the average man. He knows that a path has heart when he is one with it, when he experiences a great peace and pleasure traversing its length. The things a warrior selects to make his shields are the items of a path with heart."129

PATIENCE---

See WARRIOR.

PERCEIVING THE WORLD---

"..'perceiving the world' entails a process of apprehending whatever presents itself to us. This particular 'perceiving' is done with our senses and our will." 130 "A sorcerer uses his will to perceive the world. That perceiving, however, is not like hearing. When we look at the world or when we hear it, we have the impression that it is out there and that it is real. When we perceive the world with our will we know that it is not as 'out there' or as 'real' as we think...only a man of knowledge perceives the world with his senses and with his will and also with his seeing." 131

PERSONAL HISTORY---

"I don't have any personal history...The fact that I know whether I am a Yaqui or not does not make it personal history...Only when someone else knows that does it become personal history. And I assure you that no one will ever know that for sure...It is best to erase all personal history...because that would make us free from the encumbering thoughts of other people...I have, little by little, created a fog around me and my life...Nobody knows my personal history. Nobody knows who I am or what I do. Not even I....I personally like the ultimate freedom of being unknown...I'm not concerned with lies or truths...Lies are only lies if you have a personal history...You must simply show people whatever you care to show them, but without ever telling them exactly how you've done it."132

PERSONAL POWER---

See POWER.

PIERCING A SORCERER---

"I am going to give you a weapon to pierce her... You must ram the wild boar right into her navel. ...You must hold the wild boar in your left hand and stab her with it. She is a sorceress and the wild boar will enter her belly and no one in this world, except another sorcerer, will see it stuck there. This is not an ordinary battle but an affair of sorcerers."133

PLACE OF POWER---

"This is a place of power...This is the place where warriors were buried a long time ago...All you have to do is come here...Or spend the night on this rock in order to rearrange your feelings...Look at that circle of boulders...Fix it in your memory and then someday a crow will lead you to another one of these places. The more perfect its roundness is, the greater its power." 134

PLACE OF PREDILECTION---

"Fix all this in your memory...This spot is yours. This morning you saw, and that was the omen. You found your spot by seeing...Now properly speaking, this hilltop is your place, your beloved place; all that is around you is under your care. You must look after everything here and everything will in turn look after you...All this land, as far as you can see, is yours...Not to use but to remember. This hilltop, however, is yours to use for the rest of your life. I am giving it to you because you have found it yourself. It is yours. Accept it...This

is the place where you will come in dreaming. This is the place where you will meet with powers, where secrets will someday be revealed to you... You are hunting power and this is your place, the place where you will store your resources." [135]
"...this is the most important place of your life... This is the place where you will die...This is the site of your last stand...You will die here no matter where you are. Every warrior has a place to die. A place of his predilection which is soaked in unforgettable memories, where powerful events left their mark, a place where he has witnessed marvels, where secrets have been revealed to him, a place where he has stored his personal power...A warrior has the obligation to go back to that place of his predilection every time he taps power in order to store it there. He either goes there by means of walking or by means of dreaming." [136]

POWER---

"...there are powers on this earth that guide men and animals and everything that is living."[137] "Power was a devastating force that could easily lead to one's death and had to be treated with great care. Becoming available to power had to be done systematically, but always with great caution."[138] "Power...is a feeling that one has about certain things. Power is personal. It belongs to oneself alone...A hunter of power entraps it and then stores it away as his personal finding. Thus, personal power grows, and you may have the case of a warrior who has so much personal power that he becomes a man of knowledge."[139] "Power is a very wierd affair. In order to have it and command it one must have power to begin with. It's possible, however, to store it, little by little, until one has enough to sustain oneself in a battle of power."[140] "A warrior never turns his back to power without atoning for the favors received."[141] "Power is a personal feeling...one may call it a mood. Personal power is something that one acquires regardless of one's origin...Hunting power is a peculiar event...It first has to be an idea, then it has to be set up, step by step, and then, bingo! It happens...Hunting power is a very strange affair...There is no way to plan it ahead of time. That's what's exciting about it. A warrior proceeds as if he had a plan though, because he trusts his personal power. He knows for a fact that it will make him act in the most appropriate fashion."[142]

"Power does not belong to anyone...The key to stored power is that it can be used only to help someone else store power...Everything a man does hinges on his personal power."[143] "A warrior is impeccable when he trusts his pesonal power regardless whether it is small or enormous."[144]

POWER OBJECT---

"There are certain objects that are permeated with power....There are scores of such objects which are fostered by powerful men with the aid of friendly spirits...Properly speaking, they are in the realm of war objects...They are not really objects; rather they are types of power...Anything can be a power object...The power of an object depends on its owner, on the kind of man he is...These power objects are necessary only when a man does not have an ally."[145]

POWER PLANT---

See AID.

RATIONALITY---

"'This is all crazy,' I said. 'We are rational beings.'

'You're rational,' he retorted. 'I am not.'

'Of course you are,' I insisted. 'You are one of the most rational men I have ever met.'

'All right!' he exclaimed. 'Let us not argue. I am rational, so what?'

I involved him in the argument of why it was necessary for two rational beings to proceed in such an insane way, as we had proceeded with the lady witch.

'You're rational, all right,' he said fiercely. 'And that means you believe that you know a lot about the world, but...you have only seen the acts of people. Your experiences are limited only to what people have done to you or others. You know nothing about this mysterious unknown world.'"[146]

REALITY---

" That is all there is to reality---how you felt. "[147]

"'Do you mean, don Juan, that neither the world of ordinary men nor the world of sorcerers is real?'

'They are real worlds. They could act upon you.'" 148

"'People? But you said they were phantoms.'

'I said that they were no longer real. After my encounter with the ally nothing was real any more.'" 149

RESPECT---
See MOOD OF A WARRIOR.

RESPONSIBILITY---
"To assume the responsibility of one's decisions means that one is ready to die for them."150 "When a man decides to do something he must go all the way...but he must take responsibility for what he does. No matter what he does, he must know first why he is doing it, and then he must proceed with his actions without having doubts or remorse..."151

RING OF POWER---
"...every one of us is born...with...a little ring of power...our rings are hooked to the doing of the world in order to make the world....A man of knowledge, on the other hand, develops another ring of power. I would call it the ring of not-doing, because it is hooked to not-doing. With that ring, therefore, he can spin another world." 152 "Once one knows that world all one needs to bring it about is to use that extra ring of power I have told you sorcerers have."153

RULE---
"...if I wished to learn I had to follow the rule ..."154 "You will have to wait, the same way I did, until you give the smoke to someone else--- if you ever master it, of course. Then you will see how a man looks. That is the rule."155 "... you will learn in spite of yourself; that's the rule."156 "Don't be angry...It was not an ordinary trick. It was the rule."157

SEEING---
(Also: Seeing An Ally; Seeing Past Events.)
"In the case of seeing...thinking is not at issue."158 "Seeing is not a matter of talk."159 "If you want to see you have to let the smoke guide you...I won't talk about this anymore."160

"'What are the tentacle-like fibers, don Juan?'

'They are the tentacles that come out of a man's body which are apparent to any sorcerer who sees. Sorcerers act toward people in accordance to the way they see their tentacles.'"161

"Seeing is not so simple and only the smoke can give you the speed you need to catch a glimpse of that fleeting world...The world, when you see, is not as you think it is now."162 "...'seeing' dispelled the illusion of victory, or defeat, or suffering."163 "Seeing is not a force, but rather a way of getting through things...If a man sees he doesn't have to live like a warrior, or like anything else, for he can see things as they really are and direct his life accordingly...Upon learning to see he no longer needs to live like a warrior nor be a sorcerer. Upon learning to see a man becomes everything by becoming nothing. He, so to speak, vanishes and yet he's still there...Seeing is for impeccable men. Temper your spirit now, become a warrior, learn to see and then you'll know that there is no end to the new worlds for our vision." 164 "When you see there are no longer familiar features in the world. Everything is new. Everything has never happened before. The world is incredible."165 "Seeing is not a matter of looking and keeping quiet...Seeing is a technique one has to learn." 166 "...'seeing' as a process independent of the allies and the techniques of sorcery....Seeing is not sorcery. Yet one may easily confuse them, because a man who sees can learn, in no time at all, to manipulate an ally and may become a sorcerer. On the other hand, a man may learn certain techniques in order to command an ally and thus become a sorcerer, and yet he may never learn to see. Besides, seeing is contrary to sorcery. Seeing makes one realize the unimportance of it all." 167 "A man who sees is everything; in comparison, the sorcerer is a sad fellow."168 "...only by seeing can a man of knowledge know." 169 "Since you're not concerned with seeing, things look very much the same way every time you look at them. When you learn to see, ...a thing is never the same every time you see it, and yet it's the same." 170 "...what I want you to learn is seeing. Perhaps you know now that seeing happens only when one sneaks between the worlds, the world of ordinary people and the world of sorcerers." 171 "Power plants are only an aid...The real thing is when the body

realizes that it can see. Only then is one capable of knowing that the world we look at every day is only a description...In order to see one must learn the way sorcerers look at the world and thus the ally has to be summoned, and once that is done it comes." 172 "Seeing, of course, is the final accomplishment of a man of knowledge, and seeing is attained only when one has stopped the world through the technique of not-doing." 173

SEEING AN ALLY---
See ALLY.

SELF-IMPORTANCE---
"Self-importance is another thing that must be dropped just like personal history."174

SHADOW---
See NOT-DOING.

SHIELD---
"...a warrior selects the items that make his world. He selects deliberately, for every item he chooses is a shield that protects him from the onslaughts of the forces he is trying to use. A warrior would use his shields to protect himself from his ally... An average man who is equally surrounded by those inexplicable forces is oblivious to them because he has other kinds of special shields to protect himself....The things people do are the shields against the forces that surround us....The things a warrior selects to make his shields are the items of a path with heart." 175

SNEAKING BETWEEN THE WORLDS---
See SEEING.

SOLID---
"I'll have to take you to the water again in the twilight...You're not solid yet and you shouldn't be alone today."176 "Unfortunately, you need the water to become solid again when you use the little smoke; that puts you at a disadvantage. If you don't use the water you will probably die, but if you do use it, the spirit will take you." 177

SORCERER---
"...a master sorcerer was an eagle, or rather...he could make himself into an eagle...an evil sorcerer was...an owl...a child of the night...'brujos liricos' lyric sorcerers, meaning the dilettante sorcerers, preferred other animals---a crow, for example." 178

"Sorcery is to apply one's will to a key joint... Sorcery is interference. A sorcerer searches and finds the key joint of anything he wants to affect and then he applies his will to it. A sorcerer doesn't have to see to be a sorcerer, all he has to know is how to use his will."179 "The morning is a bad time for sorcerers." 180

SOUL---

"Sometimes a diablero may catch a soul and push it through the entrance [to the other world] and leave it in the custody of his helper until he robs the person of all his willpower. In other cases...the diablero may keep it inside his pouch, because it is too hard to carry it otherwise."181 "...if I ever found one of those beings under inappropriate circumstances I should never attempt to struggle with it because it would kill me. It would rob my soul. So I should throw myself to the ground and bear it until the morning."182

SPINNING WITH THE ALLY---

"After I grabbed it we began to spin. The ally made me twirl but I didn't let go. We spun through the air with such speed and force that I couldn't see anymore. Everything was foggy. The spinning went on, and on, and on. Suddenly I felt that I was standing on the ground again...I had an ally."183 "Your ally will spin you, alone, into unknown worlds...Spinning with your ally will change your idea of the world ...That idea is everything; and when that changes, the world itself changes."184

THE SPIRIT---

See WARRIOR.

SPIRIT---

"There are three kinds of beings...those that cannot give anything because they have nothing to give, those that can only cause fright, and those that have gifts....The third type of spirit was a true ally, a giver of secrets; that special type existed in lonely, abandoned places, places which were almost inaccessible...There were many ways in which such a being put a warrior to the test...they were truly dangerous forces, and although they could not kill a man hand to hand, they could cause his death by fright, or by actually letting objects fall on him, or by appearing suddenly and causing him to... go over a precipice...When a man is facing the ally, the giver of secrets, he has to...grab it before it grabs him...wrestle the spirit to the ground and

keep it there until it gives him power."185 "I just tapped the spirit of the water hole...That type of spirit should be tapped when the water hole is dry, when the spirit has retreated into the mountains."186

SPIRIT CATCHER---

"Mine is a wild boar. When you get one you will realize that it is alive and can teach you the different sounds it likes. With practice you will get to know your spirit catcher so well that together you will make sounds full of power."187 "The ally showed you a spirit catcher that he got from his pouch. You need one if you are going to call him...It is a fiber. With it I can call the allies, or my own ally, or I can call the spirits of the water holes, the spirits of rivers, the spirits of mountains...Those spirits are helpers. They are hard to handle and sort of dangerous. One needs an impeccable will to hold them at bay."188

SPOT---

"...a spot meant a place where a man could feel naturally happy and strong...not every place was good to sit or be on and that within the confines of the porch there was one spot that was unique, a spot where I could be at my very best....I had to "feel" all the possible spots that were accessible until I could determine without a doubt which was the right one."189 "He said that the good one was called the sitio and the bad one the enemy.... these two places were the key to a man's well-being, especially for a man who was pursuing knowledge. The sheer act of sitting on one's spot created superior strength..."190 "...in the world there were good and bad spots for me..."191

STOPPING THE WORLD---

"...in order to stop the world you must stop doing ...the proper thing to do, which a warrior does if he wants to stop the world, is to enlarge a little rock, or any other thing, by not-doing."192 "...after I had run up the hill for dear life I was in a perfect state for "stopping the world." Combined in that state were fear, awe, power and death..."193 "...it was a technique practiced by those who were hunting for power, a technique by virtue of which the world as we know it was made to collapse."194 "...once you know what it is like to stop the world you realize there is a reason for it...one of the arts of a warrior is to collapse the world for a

specific reason and then restore it again in order to keep on living."[195] "...you stopped the world and you might have even seen. A magical being told you something and your body was capable of understanding it because the world had collapsed... What stopped inside you yesterday was what people have been telling you the world is like...Yesterday the world became as sorcerers tell you it is."[196]

STORING PERSONAL POWER---
See POWER.

STRATEGY---
See WARRIOR.

STRING---
"They are not rocks...They are strings. They will hold your spot suspended...I'm going to toss each of these strings to you...Each of these is a string, a string that could kill us if we leave it around loose; so you simply can't make any mistakes."[197]
"...the 'bed of strings' was made exclusively to allow a warrior to arrive at a certain state of peace and well-being."[198]

STRIKING A BLOW AT A DISTANCE---
See FLYING.

STRUGGLE---
See WARRIOR.

SUMMONING THE ALLY---
See ALLY, SEEING.

TAMING AN ALLY---
See ALLY.

TAP---
(Also: Tapping An Ally.)
"You've tapped an ally."[199] "You know nothing about the forces you're tapping...You have succumbed to the force of the water-hole spirit and now it can take you at any time."[200]

TRAP---
"'I'm green...'

'Cut it out...You have no time. Get out of there. The water is about to trap you. Get out of it! Out! Out!'"[201]

"I began moving my arm and in a short while my hand became ice cold. I had begun to feel a sort of mushiness around my hand. It was as if I were paddling through some heavy viscous liquid matter.

Don Juan made a sudden movement and grabbed my arm to stop the motion...

'Not-doing is only for very strong warriors and you don't have the power to deal with it yet. Now you will only trap horrendous things with your hand.'"202

TRICK---

"Whatever I have done to you today was a trick... The rule is that a man of knowledge has to trap his apprentice. Today I have trapped you and I have tricked you into learning."203 "The average man, in ignorance, believes that those forces can be explained or changed...The sorcerer, on the other hand, does not think of explaining or changing them; instead he uses such forces by redirecting himself and adapting to their directions. That's his trick. There is very little to sorcery once you find out its trick." 204

TRUST IN ONE'S PERSONAL POWER---

See POWER.

UNDERSTANDING---

"If you say you understand my knowledge, you have done nothing new...As far as I know there are only eight points a man is capable of handling. Perhaps men cannot go beyond that. And I said handling, not understanding, did you get that?...Your problem is that you want to understand everything. If you insist on understanding you're not considering your entire lot as a human being...Understanding is only a very small affair, so very small....You fail every time because of your insistence on understanding."205 "Sure I can explain anything...But could you understand it?"206 "Genaro and I are acting from here," he said and pointed to one of the centers of radiation in his diagram. "And it is not the center of understanding, yet you know what it is."207

USING DEATH AS AN ADVISOR---

See DEATH.

VENTURING INTO THE UNKNOWN---

See DEATH.

WAITING FOR WILL---
See WILL.

WARRIOR---
"A warrior should be prepared only to battle...The spirit of a warrior is not geared to...winning or losing. The spirit of a warrior is geared only to struggle, and every struggle is a warrior's last battle on earth."[208] "...the difference between a hunter and a warrior is that a warrior is on his way to power, while a hunter knows nothing or very little about it."[209] "A warrior uses his will and his patience to forget. In fact a warrior has only his will and his patience with them he builds anything he wants."[210] "Life for a warrior is an exercise in strategy...a warrior is never available.."[211] "A warrior is never idle and never in a hurry... To meet an ally a man must be a spotless warrior or the ally may turn against him and destroy him."[212]

WELL-BEING---
"...you want to remain the same even at the cost of your well-being."[213] "...well-being was a condition one had to groom, a condition one had to become acquainted with in order to seek it...The trick is in what one emphasizes...We either make ourselves miserable, or we make ourselves strong. The amount of work is the same."[214]

WIDE-AWAKE---
See MOOD OF A WARRIOR.

WILL---
"Will is something very special. It happens mysteriously. There is no real way of telling how one uses it, except that the results of using the will are astounding...A warrior...knows that he is waiting for his will...What a sorcerer calls will is a power within ourselves. It is not a thought, or an object or a wish. To stop asking questions is not will because it needs thinking and wishing. Will is what can make you succeed when your thoughts tell you that you're defeated. Will is what makes you invulnerable. Will is what sends a sorcerer through a wall; through space; to the moon, if he wants...He described will as a force which was the true link between men and the world."[215] "Will is a force, a power."[216]

WORLD---

"...the world was whatever we perceive, in any manner we may choose to perceive."[217] "Why should the world be only as you think it is? Who gave you the authority to say so?...The world is very strange at this time of day [sunset]."[218] "The world is a mystery...And it is not at all as you picture it...Well, it is also as you picture it, but that's not all there is to the world; there is much more to it." [219]

THE WORLD ACTING UPON SOMEONE---

See REALITY.

WORTHY OPPONENT---

"...the instant one begins to live like a warrior, one is no longer ordinary...I didn't find you a worthy opponent because I wanted to play with you, or tease you, or annoy you. A worthy opponent might spur you on; under the influence of 'la Calatina' you may have to make use of everything I have taught you. You don't have any other alternative."[220]

FOOTNOTES: APPENDIX A

1. Castañeda, C., A Separate Reality, (SR), New York, Simon and Shuster, 1971, pp. 218-9.
2. Castañeda, C., Journey to Ixtlan, (JI), New York, Simon and Shuster, 1972, p. 91.
3. JI, p. 95.
4. SR, p. 220.
5. JI, p. 61.
6. JI, p. 112.
7. JI, p. 25.
8. JI, p. 39.
9. Castañeda, C., The Teachings of Don Juan, (TDJ), Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968, p. 44.
10. JI, p. 302.
11. TDJ, pp. 44-5.
12. SR, p. 53.
13. SR, p. 54.
14. SR, p. 233.
15. TDJ, p. 41.
16. JI, p. 165.
17. TDJ, p. 2.
18. JI, p. 257.
19. TDJ, p. 2.
20. JI, p. 109.
21. SR, p. 33.
22. TDJ, p. 25.

23. SR, p. 97.
24. SR, p. 101.
25. SR, p. 105.
26. SR, p. 186.
27. SR, p. 178.
28. JI, p. 54.
29. JI, p. 191.
30. SR, p. 239.
31. JI, p. 55.
32. JI, pp. 62-6.
33. JI, p. 167.
34. TDJ, p. 167.
35. SR, p. 235.
36. SR, pp. 183-4.
37. TDJ, pp. 47-9.
38. TDJ, p. 57.
39. TDJ, p. 60.
40. TDJ, pp. 3-4.
41. JI, p. 189.
42. JI, p. 176.
43. TDJ, pp. 111-2.
44. JI, pp. 226-7.
45. JI, pp. 119-20.
46. JI, pp. 126-7.
47. JI, p. 238.
48. TDJ, pp. 179-80.
49. JI, p. 61.

50. JI, p. 165.
51. JI, p. 291.
52. SR, p. 155.
53. JI, p. 77.
54. TDJ, p. 20.
55. JI, p. 232.
56. TDJ, pp. 129-31.
57. SR, pp. 33-4.
58. SR, p. 218.
59. SR, p. 180.
60. SR, p. 179.
61. SR, p. 239.
62. SR, p. 179.
63. SR, p. 146.
64. SR, p. 147.
65. SR, p. 154.
66. SR, pp. 161-2.
67. SR, pp. 206-7.
68. TDJ, p. 194.
69 SR, pp. 269-70.
70. JI, pp. 76-8.
71. JI, pp. 105-6.
72. JI, pp. 94-5.
73. TDJ, p. 41.
74. JI, p. 39.
75. SR, p. 179.

76. SR, p. 183.
77. JI, p. 291.
78. SR, p. 305.
79. TDJ, pp. 12-3.
80. SR, pp. 240-1.
81. JI, p. 213.
82. TDJ, pp. 45-6.
83. TDJ, p. 56.
84. SR, p. 110.
85. SR, p. 187.
86. TDJ, p. 42.
87. JI, p. 216.
88. TDJ, p. 79.
89. JI, pp. 232-3.
90. JI, p. 298.
91. TDJ, p. 135.
92. SR, pp. 52-3.
93. SR, p. 152.
94. TDJ, pp. 77-8.
95. SR, p. 40.
96. SR, pp. 106-7.
97. SR, p. 110.
98. JI, p. 136.
99. TDJ, pp. 39-41.
100. TDJ, pp. 86-7.
101. TDJ, p. 102.

102. TDJ, p. 151.
103. JI, pp. 149-51.
104. TDJ, p. 43.
105. JI, p. 138.
106. JI, p. 139.
107. TDJ, p. 131.
108. SR, p. 210.
109. SR, p. 215.
110. TDJ, p. 49.
111. TDJ, pp. 79-83.
112. JI, p. 217.
113. JI, p. 226.
114. JI, p. 229.
115. JI, p. 233.
116. JI, p. 234.
117. JI, pp. 238-9.
118. JI, pp. 173-4.
119. TDJ, p. 195.
120. SR, p. 140.
121. SR, p. 310.
122. JI, p. 213.
123. TDJ, p. 43.
124. SR, p. 153.
125. JI, p. 315.
126. TDJ, pp. 105-6.

127. TDJ, pp. 166-7.

128. TDJ, pp. 194-5.

129. SR, p. 262.

130. SR, p. 180.

131. SR, p. 181.

132. JI, pp. 29-35.

133. SR, pp. 250-1.

134. JI, pp. 134-5.

135. JI, pp. 182-4.

136. JI, p. 187.

137. JI, p. 106.

138. JI, p. 133.

139. JI, p. 153.

140. JI, p. 167.

141. JI, p. 169.

142. JI, pp. 192-4.

143. JI, p. 199.

144. JI, p. 204.

145. TDJ, pp. 10-13.

146. JI, p. 257.

147. TDJ, p. 143.

148. JI, p. 300.

149. JI, p. 311.

150. JI, p. 65.

151. JI, p. 61.

152. JI, p. 252.

153. JI, p. 301.

154. TDJ, p. 107.

155. TDJ, p. 146.

156. TDJ, p. 42.

157. SR, p. 256.

158. SR, p. 108.

159. SR, p. 130.

160. SR, p. 112.

161. SR, p. 131.

162. SR, p. 131.

162. SR, p. 138.

163. SR, p. 169.

164. SR, pp. 181-7.

165. SR, p. 194.

166. SR, p. 200.

167. SR, pp. 203-4.

168. SR, p. 240.

169. SR, p. 20.

170. SR, p. 50.

171. JI, p. 300.

172. JI, p. 302.

173. JI, p. 233.

174. JI, p. 41.

175. SR, pp. 260-4.

176. SR, p. 233.

177. SR, p. 274.

178. SR, p. 122.

179. SR, p. 240-1.

180. SR, p. 234.

181. TDJ, pp. 196-7.

182. SR, p. 282.

183. JI, p. 306.

184. JI, p. 313.

185. SR, pp. 280-3.

186. SR, p. 198.

187. SR, p. 198.

188. SR, p. 273.

189. TDJ, pp. 19-20.

190. TDJ, p. 25.

191. JI, p. 77.

192. JI, p. 228.

193. JI, p. 133.

194. JI, p. 133.

195. JI, p. 168.

196. JI, p. 299.

197. JI, p. 180.

198. JI, p. 221.

199. SR, p. 233.

200. SR, p. 218.

201. SR, p. 212.

202. JI, pp. 231-2.

203. SR, p. 255.

204. SR, p. 258.

205. SR, pp. 310-5.

206. JI, p. 229.

207. SR, p. 314.

208. SR, p. 259.

209. JI, pp. 118-9.

210. SR, p. 177.

211. SR, pp. 219-20.

212. SR, pp. 232-3.

213. SR, p. 13.

214. JI, p. 221.

215. SR, pp. 178-80.

216. SR, p. 181.

217. SR, p. 180.

218. JI, p. 84.

219. JI, p. 200.

220. JI, p. 267.

APPENDIX B

AN ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF CONCEPTS IN DON JUAN'S CONCEPTUAL SYSTEM, AND FAMILIAR ANALOGUES

The list of terms denoting concepts in don Juan's conceptual system will be given alphabetically; where a term is ambiguous, subscripts will be used to indicate each clearly separate sense in which it is used. Wherever possible, familiar concepts which are analogous or which overlap in their range of application will be provided, with a rough estimate of the degree of overlap given, on a scale of 0 to 3 ('0', '1', '2', and '3', indicate "no apparent analogue," "slight overlap," "considerable overlap" and "total, or nearly total, overlap," respectively). 'D' will indicate obvious important disanalogies or qualifications, so the result will be a conceptual determination of the alien concepts. In some cases where there appear to be no familiar concepts which are analogous, I may provide unfamiliar analogues (i.e., concepts taken from other conceptual systems) and give their origin.

ABANDON (2) abandon; let oneself go; D: at the same time, one must be in complete control.

ABANDON ONESELF (2) voluntarily relinquish self-control; put oneself at the mercy of one's environment.

ABSOLUTE ASSURANCE (3) complete self-confidence.

ACCESSIBLE (2) accessible; unguardedly exposed; D: it involves a mental state rather than mere physical presence of proximity.

ACTION (2) action; D: the importance of action is the effect it has on the subject rather than on objects in the world. It is invariably reflexive.

AFFECT (2) affect; D: there is great discrepancy in the sorts of entities which can be affected by and which can affect men.

AGREEMENT FROM THE WORLD (1) an event which provides immediate evidence supporting a particular assertion; D: the event is not obviously logically or causally related to what is asserted; it merely occurs immediately after the assertion.

AID (0)

ALERT (3) alert.

$ALLY_1$ (a 'power') (0)

$ALLY_2$ (a 'spirit') (0)

$ALLY_1$ ADVISING A MAN (0)

$ALLY_1$ CARRYING A MAN OUTSIDE HIMSELF (0)

$ALLY_1$ FURTHERING A MAN'S KNOWLEDGE (0)

$ALLY_1$ GIVING STRENGTH (0)

$ALLY_2$ GIVING POWER (0)

$ALLY_1$ REMOVING A MAN'S BODY (0)

$ALLY_{1,2}$ TAPPING A MAN (0)

ANGER (3) anger.

APPRENTICE (3) apprentice.

ATTACHMENT (3) attachment.

BATTLE (1) battle; D: although physical combat may be involved, the forces against which the battle is directed are non-material. It involves being in a particular state of mind, and possibly following certain rules.

BATTLE OF POWER (0)

BECOMING A MAN OF KNOWLEDGE (0)

BECOMING ACCESSIBLE TO POWER (0)

BECOMING ONE WITH THE ALLY$_1$ (0)

THE BEGINNING (2) starting point; point of reference;
D: Fixed points of reference are illusory, and exist only in thought. One is always in the eternal here and now.

BEING IN PERFECT BALANCE WITH EVERYTHING (0) (going with the flow, as in Eastern philosophy and religion)

BENEFACTOR (2) instructor who chooses his student(s);
D: The relationship is more like a craftsman/apprentice relationship. The most significant difference is that the benefactor must trick his apprentice into learning.

BODY (3) body.

BRING ABOUT THE WORLD OF SORCERERS (0)

BRUJO (2) medicine man, curer, witch, sorcerer; a person with extraordinary, usually evil powers;
D: The powers which he has are not mysterious; their acquisition and use are fully intelligible in terms of don Juan's system.

CHANGE$_1$ (2) altering personality or character; D: This is only regarded as a preparation for the change, which happens suddenly.

CHANGE$_2$ (2) dramatic and sudden personal change; D: in don Juan's system, a man is 'really' unchangeable.

CHANGE$_3$ (0)

CHOOSING AN APPRENTICE (2) selecting able students;
D: The selection is based on omens. It is really impersonal forces which decide who is able to pursue the course; the benefactor must heed the omens.

CLARITY (2) state of mind in which one sees things clearly;
D: although this is a desirable state, in don

Juan's system it is also a limitation which must be overcome; there is much more to learning than merely seeing things clearly.

CLOSING ONE'S GAP (0)

COLOR (3) color (including associated effects); D: The effect of colors is personally determined rather than universal; the presence of certain colors may be significant in guiding action.

CONSTANT (2) invariable; predictable.

CONTROL (3) control.

CONTROLLED FOLLY (0)

COURAGE (3) courage.

CREATING POWER OBJECTS (0) blessing medals, crucifixes, etc. (Christianity).

CROW (2) crow; D: They are unique among birds in that their call or flight is an omen. Furthermore, they are of a form which a man can learn to assume.

DEATH (2) death; The Grim Reaper; D: This is somewhat of an anthropomorphic concept of death; yet it is personal and takes on a unique form for each of us. It has a location, to our left at arm's length.

DECISION (3) decision.

DEFEAT (2) defeat; D: The ways in which one may meet defeat are more esoteric; e.g., of the four natural enemies, only fear is a familiar foe.

DETACHMENT (3) detachment.

DETECT MESSAGES (1) find hidden meanings; D: The messages have practical import. The circumstances under which one receives them are never ordinary.

DEVIL'S WEED (1) datura plant; D: As an entity of dual nature, devil's weed is also non-material insofar as it is used in the system.

DIABLERO (1) evil sorcerer (cf. BRUJO); D: A diablero is a brujo who can change form at will, and become an animal.

DIRECTION (3) direction (usually using compass orientation).

DIVINING (3) divining.

DOING (1) ordinary everyday activity; D: This category does not exhaust the possibilities of action; it gains sense from a contrast with not-doing.

DREAMING (1) dreaming while aware that one is dreaming; D: The degree of control and deliberation involved make it equivalent to the state of being awake. One is able to perform extraordinary feats.

EMISSARIES (0)

ENGAGE A WORTHY OPPONENT(0)

EXPLANATION (3) explanation.

FEAR (1) fear; anxiety; D: It is not desirable to eliminate fear, only to overcome it.

FEELING (1) feeling (not as in the sense of touch); impression; D: It is a form of perception more basic than the senses, and not opposed to them.

FEELING THE LINES OF THE WORLD (0)

FEELING THE WORLD (0)

FIBERS (0)

FINDING A SPOT (1) choosing a comfortable location; D: It is a technique which requires that one feel with one's eyes.

FLYING (1) astral travel (mysticism and the occult).

FOLLOWING THE RULE (1) obeying instructions; adhering to ritual; D: The mental orientation is important, not merely the overt procedure. The rationale for some rules is intuitively obvious; for others, apparently quite arbitrary.

FORCE (0)

FORCES GUIDING MEN'S LIVES (0)

GAIT OF POWER (1) technique for running in the dark;
D: This requires a state of controlled abandon.

GAP (0)

GATHERING POWER PLANTS (3) collecting peyote, jimson weed, mushrooms, etc.

GETTING A HELPER (0)

GETTING INTO THE OTHER WORLD (0)

GRABBING ONTO SOMETHING WITH ONE'S WILL (0)

GREEN FOG (0)

GUARDIAN (0)

HANDLE (1) cope with; D: That with which one copes cannot be understood; it is a non-cognitive activity.

HAVING FEELINGS TOWARD THE GUARDIAN (0)

HELPER (0)

HOLES (in sound) (1) pauses between a series of sounds; D: The sounds must be perceived as a structure or pattern; the pauses are entities of equal status as the sounds.

HUNTER (1) hunter; D: Learning how to hunt does not make one a hunter. A hunter must be in perfect balance with everything.

HUNTING (1) hunting; D: The entities for which a member of the system may hunt are not only animals, or even material objects.

HUNTING POWER (0)

IMPECCABLE (1) at one's best; D: This is a mood or state.

INACCESSIBLE (1) not accessible; D: This is not a matter of hiding or refusing to deal with people. Again it is a way of living in a particular state of mind.

INDICATION (1) omen; D: It is not merely of import for action, but signifies crucial information about a person (e.g., concerning his personal power).

INDULGENCE (1) overindulgence; (succumbing to) a bad habit or something weakening; D: It is a result of an attitude of willingness to abandon oneself.

INSTRUMENT (0)

KEEPER (0)

KEY JOINT (1) crucial or central component; D: It is crucial for the functioning of whatever it is a sorcerer wishes to affect; it is to this that he applies his will.

LEARNING (1) learning (how and that); D: The process is connected to personal change. The things learned sometimes defy description or understanding.

LEARNING HOW TO BECOME A CROW (0)

LEARNING HOW TO MOVE (0)

LEARNING HOW TO SEE (0)

LIFE (3) life.

LINES OF THE WORLD (0)

LITTLE SMOKE (1) herb and mushroom mixture (psylocybe) which is smoked/ingested; D: A similar disanalogy as with DEVIL'S WEED applies.

LIZARD (3) lizard.

MAKING A SPIRIT CATCHER (0)

MAKING SOMEONE SOLID (or UNSOLID) (0)

MAN OF KNOWLEDGE (0)

MEETING WITH AN ALLY (1) using a particular psychotropic plant; D: The ally, however, is perceived as an entity or a quality and can interact with the subject. This is a preparatory step to familiarize the apprentice with the ally before he tackles him.

MESCALITO (1) peyote (Lophophora williamsii); D: There is a similar disanalogy as with DEVIL'S WEED and LITTLE SMOKE.

MIND (2) man's rational faculty; D: in don Juan's discussions the implication is that it is not a neutral, but a biased faculty due to what people have consistently said the world is like.

MITOTE (3) ritualized sessions (though loosely structured) where a group of peyoteros meet to ingest peyote (MESCALITO).

MOOD OF A WARRIOR (2) state of mind of one engaged in a professional activity; D: One can be in this state when doing anything which one knows how to do well (i.e., where no further information need be integrated in order to act efficaciously).

MOVING (1) telekinesis; teleportation (E.S.P. studies, mysticism).

NAMES (1) special names reserved for emergency invocation; D: These are only the unique, private names of Mescalito and one's ally.

NATURAL ENEMIES (1) subjective obstacles to learning; D: These are not general personal failings, but specific factors which the apprentice will encounter.

NIGHT (2) night; darkness; D: The time when one is most likely to encounter powers; in fact, the night is power.

NOT-DOING (1) meditation (Eastern philosophy; mysticism); D: Not-doing is primarily perceptual in nature, of a pre-cognitive orientation, whereas meditation is an internal experience which tends to suppress all sensory input.

OLD AGE (3) old age.

OMEN (3) omen.

OPENING ONE'S GAP (0)

OTHER WORLD (0)

OVERCOMING THE GUARDIAN (0)

OVERCOMING THE GREEN FOG (0)

PASSING THE PIPE TO AN APPRENTICE (2) giving the pipe to an apprentice for his own use with the smoking mix-

ture; D: There is a proper procedure for this, which if not followed could lead to their deaths.

PATH OF KNOWLEDGE (1) course of study; D: This is an attitude with which one tackles the unknown, rather than a body of facts.

PATH WITH HEART (1) living for oneself; D: This is doing what is pleasurable; however, what is pleasurable is identified with one's enlightened self-interest.

PATIENCE (3) patience.

PERFORMING SORCERY WITH POWER OBJECTS (0)

PERCEIVING THE WORLD (1) perception; D: What constitutes perception is what one is aware of. There are different modes of perception, only one of which corresponds to our concept of normal sensory perception.

PERSONAL HISTORY (2) data concerning a person's past life; D: A fact must be known before it constitutes personal history; e.g., because no one knows don Juan's past life, he has no personal history.

PERSONAL POWER (0)

PEYOTERO (3) one who uses peyote.

PIERCING A SORCERER (0)

PLACE OF POWER (1) hallowed ground (Christianity); the tabernacle in Catholic churches; D: One meets with powers there.

PLACE OF PREDILECTION (1) favorite retreat; D: This is of momentous significance for a man of knowledge. It is the focal point of his life, and eventually his death.

PLANT (3) plant.

POWER (0)

POWER OBJECT (1) lucky charm; holy medals; amulets; D: The objects are power objects because of the personal power of whoever created them, not in themselves.

POWER PLANT (2) psychotropic plant; D: The use of such plants leads to power.

PREPARED (3) prepared; ready for anything.

PREPARING POWER PLANTS (3) preparing mixtures of psychotropic plants according to a specific set of instructions; for example, as a pharmacist prepares prescriptions.

RATIONALITY (2) rationality within a conceptual system. D: This concept may be taken as absolute if one views it from within a conceptual system which regards itself as absolute.

REALITY (2) reality. D: Although it is considered to be 'what there is', our concept regards it as objective, don Juan's as subjective.

RESPECT (3) respect.

RESPONSIBILITY (3) responsibility.

RING OF POWER (0)

ROBBING ONE'S SOUL (0)

ROUTINE (3) routine; acting in a predictable manner.

RULE (1) regulation; D: Guidelines for behaviour when dealing with sorcery; they are designed to put the person in the proper frame of mind.

SEEING (0)

SEEING AN ALLY (0)

SEEING THE LINES OF THE WORLD (0)

SELF-IMPORTANCE (3) self-importance.

SET UP DREAMING (0)

SHADOW (1) shadow; D: They are the doors of not-doing, the key to power.

SHIELD (0)

SNEAKING BETWEEN THE TWO WORLDS (0)

SOLID (0)

SORCERER (1) warlock; sorcerer; D: The ability to apply one's will is the only condition necessary to be a sorcerer.

SOUL (1) soul; D: The soul is not a spirit in don Juan's system; in fact, it does not function as an entity of any sort.

SPINNING WITH THE ALLY$_1$ (0)

(THE) SPIRIT$_1$ (1) an attitude of willingness to learn in spite of any obstacles; D: It cannot be willingness to undergo the apprenticeship in the sense of wanting to, however; that would indicate that one was "cracked" and would mean disqualification from selection.

SPIRIT$_2$ (1) spirit; ghost.

SPIRIT$_2$ CATCHER (0)

SPOT (1) comfortable or uncomfortable location; D: The spots have an actual effect on a person, sometimes of considerable significance.

STORING PERSONAL POWER (0)

STOPPING THE WORLD (0)

STRATEGY (3) strategy.

STRIKING A BLOW AT A DISTANCE (0)

STRING (0)

STRUGGLE (3) struggle.

SUMMONING THE ALLY$_1$ (0)

TACKLING THE ALLY$_1$ (0)

TALKING (3) talking.

TAMING AN ALLY$_1$ (0)

TAP (0)

TAPPING AN ALLY$_{1,2}$ (0)

THINKING (3) thinking.

TIGHT (2) having developed a strong character.
D: The concept refers to a way of living in which one does not dissipate personal power.

TRAP (1) trap: D: One can trap non-material entities, and be trapped by them.

TRICK (3) trick.

TRUST IN ONE'S PERSONAL POWER (1) self-confidence;
D: Everything one does depends on personal power; hesitation or doubt prevents its optimum use.

TRUTH (2) truth; that which is the case; D: What is said to be true; there is no ultimacy in what is the case, and little import for whether, if not how, one acts.

UNBENDING INTENT (3) unswerving dedication.

UNDERSTANDING (2) understanding. D: To understand something in don Juan's system means that one has done nothing; it is a very insigifniciant part of the system. One should strive to learn to handle things rather than understand them.

USING DEATH AS AN ADVISOR (0)

USING POWER PLANTS (1) employing psychotropic drugs;
D: There is a set procedure to be followed, as well as a system within which the experiences must be interpreted.

USING A SPIRIT CATCHER (0)

VENTURING INTO THE UNKNOWN (0)

WARRIOR (2) warrior; D: This involves a way of life in which one learns to tighten one's life in order to withstand the rigors of the apprenticeship.

WELL-BEING (3) well-being.

WIDE AWAKE (3) totally aware.

WILL (1) willpower; D: It is a mode of perception as well as a means for performing sorcery (in the narrow sense).

WAITING FOR WILL (0)

WIND (3) wind.

WORLD (1) world; D: Subjective orientation which regards whatever is perceived as the world.

WORLD OF ORDINARY MEN (3) the world.

WORLD OF SORCERERS (0)

WORLD ACTING ON SOMEONE (0)

WORTHY OPPONENT (0)

APPENDIX C

CONCEPTS IN DON JUAN'S SYSTEM

CATEGORIZED BY DEGREE OF OVERLAP

WITH THE RANGE OF APPLICATION OF FAMILIAR CONCEPTS

(3)

ABSOLUTE ASSURANCE
ALERT
ANGER
APPRENTICE
ATTACHMENT
BODY
COLOR
CONTROL
COURAGE
DECISION
DETACHMENT
DIRECTION
DIVINING
EXPLANATION
GATHERING PLANTS
LIFE
LIZARD
MITOTE
OLD AGE
OMEN
PATIENCE
PEYOTERO
PLANT
PREPARED
PREPARING POWER PLANTS
RESPECT
RESPONSIBILITY
ROUTINE
SELF-IMPORTANCE
STRATEGY
STRUGGLE
TALKING
THINKING
UNBENDING INTENT
WELL-BEING
WIDE AWAKE
WIND
WORLD OF ORDINARY MEN

(2)

ABANDON
ABANDON ONESELF
ACCESSIBLE
ACTION
AFFECT
THE BEGINNING
BENEFACTOR
BRUJO
CHANGE[1,2]
CHOOSING AN APPRENTICE
CLARITY
CONSTANT
CROW
DEATH
DEFEAT
MOOD OF A WARRIOR
NIGHT
PASSING THE PIPE TO AN APPRENTICE
PERSONAL HISTORY
POWER PLANT
RATIONALITY
REALITY
TRUTH
UNDERSTANDING
WARRIOR

(1)

AGREEMENT FROM THE WORLD
BATTLE
DETECT MESSAGES
DEVIL'S WEED
DIABLERO
DOING
DREAMING
FEAR
FEELING
FINDING A SPOT
FLYING
FOLLOWING THE RULE
GAIT OF POWER
HANDLE
HOLES (IN SOUND)
HUNTER
HUNTING
IMPECCABLE
INACCESSIBLE
INDICATION

(1) Continued

INDULGENCE
KEY JOINT
LEARNING
LITTLE SMOKE
MEETING WITH AN ALLY$_1$
MESCALITO
MIND
MOVING
NAMES
NATURAL ENEMIES
NOT-DOING
PATH OF KNOWLEDGE
PATH WITH HEART
PERCEIVING THE WORLD
PLACE OF POWER
PLACE OF PREDILECTION
POWER OBJECT
RULE
SHADOW
SOLID
SORCERER
SOUL
THE SPIRIT
SPIRIT
SPOT
TRAP
TRUST IN ONE'S PERSONAL POWER
USING POWER PLANTS
VENTURING INTO THE UNKNOWN
WILL
WORLD

(0)

AID
ALLY$_{1,2}$
ALLY$_1$ ADVISING A MAN
ALLY$_1$ CARRYING A MAN OUTSIDE HIMSELF
ALLY$_1$ FURTHERING A MAN'S KNOWLEDGE
ALLY$_1$ GIVING STRENGTH
ALLY$_2$ GIVING POWER
ALLY$_1$ GUIDING A MAN'S ACTS
ALLY$_1$ REMOVING A MAN'S BODY
ALLY$_{1,2}$ TAPPING A MAN
BATTLE OF POWER
BECOMING ACCESSIBLE TO POWER

BECOMING A MAN OF KNOWLEDGE
BECOMING ONE WITH THE ALLY$_1$
BEING IN PERFECT BALANCE WITH EVERYTHING
BRING ABOUT THE WORLD OF SORCERERS
CHANGE$_3$
CLOSING ONE'S GAP
CONTROLLED FOLLY
CREATING POWER OBJECTS
EMISSARIES
ENGAGE A WORTHY OPPONENT
FEELING THE LINES OF THE WORLD
FIBERS
FORCE
FORCES GUIDING MEN'S LIVES
GAP
GETTING A HELPER
GETTING INTO THE OTHER WORLD
GRABBING ONTO SOMETHING WITH ONE'S WILL
GREEN FOG
GUARDIAN
HAVING A FEELING TOWARD THE GUARDIAN
HELPER
HUNTING POWER
INSTRUMENT
KEEPER
LEARNING TO BECOME A CROW
LEARNING HOW TO MOVE
LEARNING HOW TO SEE
LINES OF THE WORLD
MAKING A SPIRIT CATCHER
MAKING SOMEONE SOLID (OR UNSOLID)
MAN OF KNOWLEDGE OPENING ONE'S GAP
OTHER WORLD
OVERCOMING THE GUARDIAN
OVERCOMING THE GREEN FOG
PERSONAL POWER
PIERCING A SORCERER
POWER
RING OF POWER
ROBBING ONE'S SOUL
SEEING
SEEING AN ALLY$_{1,2}$
SEEING THE LINES OF THE WORLD
SET UP DREAMING
SHIELD
SNEAKING BETWEEN THE TWO WORLDS
SPINNING WITH THE ALLY$_1$
SPIRIT CATCHER

APPENDIX D

A DESCRIPTION OF THE ROLE OF CONCEPTS IN DON JUAN'S SYSTEM

Terms which are used to indicate concepts in this system have been placed in single quotation marks.

1. Persons

The status of a person in don Juan's system depends on the degree to which he has progressed toward the goal of 'becoming a man of knowledge'. Under the guidance of a 'benefactor', who is a 'man of knowledge', the 'apprentice' usually 'learns' to first become a 'hunter', then a 'warrior', as he becomes engaged in 'hunting power' and 'storing personal power'. When a 'warrior' has developed his 'will', he then becomes a 'sorcerer'; a sufficient condition for being a 'sorcerer' is the ability to apply one's 'will' to a 'key joint'.

To some extent, 'sorcerer' and 'man of knowledge' are interchangeable, though only in informal discourse where the distinction between 'knowledge' and 'sorcery' is unimportant. There is further latitude in substituting 'brujo' or 'diablero' for 'sorcerer', though the Spanish terms have further connotations and are not themselves strictly interchangeable; a 'diablero' is a 'brujo' who can adopt the form of animals, and is also considered to practice 'black sorcery'.

A 'warrior' may become a 'man of knowledge' by storing sufficient 'power'. In order to succeed at this task, it is of practical necessity to 'tame an ally'. However, there is no one act or event which transforms the 'apprentice' into a 'man of knowledge'. Furthermore, a 'man of knowledge' may yet be a 'sorcerer' or a 'warrior' or both, perhaps even a 'hunter'. The loose concept 'man of knowledge' permits one to view it as an attainable goal, and in this sense, there are actual examples; however, when the concept is tightened by giving necessary and sufficient conditions,

then by its very nature it proves to be unattainable, for it is necessary to defeat the 'four natural enemies': 'fear', 'clarity', 'power', and 'old age'. Of course, the last enemy is invincible, yet must be constantly fought off. Thus there is no finality in 'becoming a man of knowledge'; one is ceaselessly engaged in this enterprise until 'tapped by one's death'. Nevertheless, for practical purposes, it is useful to employ the loose sense of the term, and in fact don Juan nearly invariably does so.

When one is a 'man of knowledge' in this sense, it is common for him to select one or more 'apprentice' to teach his 'knowledge'. This is done on the basis of 'omens' which are 'indications' that those chosen (los escogidos) have the aptitude and temperament required for 'learning' (i.e., those who have already a sufficient level of 'personal power'). Paradoxically, those who are qualified would never choose to 'learn' voluntarily and must be 'tricked' into it; such is the 'rule'.

2. Man of Knowledge

'Man of knowledge' is the central concept in don Juan's system; it is not merely a personal goal, but is a concise expression for the entire form of life. The constant 'struggle' against the 'four natural enemies' and the handships involved in following the 'path of knowledge' are more than amply compensated for by the rewards brought by following a 'path with heart'. The highest achievement of a 'man of knowledge' is 'seeing'. If a 'man of knowledge' can 'see', he need only follow a 'path with heart'; his actions will always be appropriate because he will always be able to 'see' how things are. When dealing with his fellow men, a 'man of knowledge' will always exercise his 'controlled folly'; everything we do is 'folly', but for one who 'sees', it is possible to bring it under 'control'.

3. Aspects of Persons

Don Juan makes use of a 'body'/'soul' dualism which emphasizes the limitations of the rational mind. In many instances, it is explicitly stated that it is the 'body' which 'learns' a particular activity or technique. In other instances, one is forced to 'battle' for one's 'soul' against inimical 'forces' or 'diableros'. A specific elaboration of either concept is not available, although 'soul' and 'will' are intimately connected. The

'mind' is not an explicit concept in the system and is only implicitly discussed in don Juan's attempt to de-emphasize the activities of the 'rational' orientation of Castañeda's mind (i.e., 'thinking', 'talking', 'understanding', etc.); his system of 'knowledge' is practical in that one 'learns' by 'acting', not by 'thinking' about 'acting'.

4. Personal Factors

Don Juan's teachings are personally directed, and in order to 'learn' it is necessary for the 'apprentice' to undergo a significant personal 'change'. Although this 'change' is to occur suddenly and dramatically, considerable preparation is required in the way of tightening his life. Particular moods, attitudes, states, characteristics, kinds of behavior, etc., are to be cultivated; others eliminated. The only general personal requirement of the 'apprentice' is that he have 'the spirit'. Negative features which must be dropped from his life are: 'personal history', feeling 'self-important', falling into 'routines', 'indulging', 'abandoning oneself', and being unwittingly 'accessible'.

As a 'hunter' the 'apprentice' 'learns' how to 'be in perfect balance with everything'; as a 'warrior' he 'learns' that in order to be 'impeccable', he must 'trust his personal power', whether it be great or small. He must 'learn' to live like a 'warrior', and going to 'knowledge' as one goes to war involves being in a state of 'fear', but 'wide-awake'; he must have 'respect' and yet have 'complete assurance'. His 'unbending intent' as he proceeds along the 'path of knowledge' will overcome his 'fear'; 'courage' is not really an important element in the make-up of a 'warrior', but is merely discussed in order to illustrate the disanalogy with 'will'. It is advisable for the 'apprentice' to 'learn' the 'mood of a warrior' and always 'act' in that mood. The 'mood of a warrior' is a state of both full 'control' and complete 'abandon'. Furthermore, a 'warrior' is always 'alert' and 'prepared'; he accepts full 'responsibility' for his 'acts', 'using death as an advisor' while cultivating complete 'detachment' in the face of his immanent 'death'. This 'detachment' is far from an acceptance of 'death', for a 'warrior' should be prepared only to do 'battle', to 'struggle'; he never 'abandons himself' to anything, not even his 'death'. A 'warrior's' 'life' is a series of 'decisions' which he must make in the light of his inevitable 'death'; this gives his 'decisions' 'power'.

5. Activities

Since the only thing which counts is 'action' (in order to 'learn', one must tackle everything oneself), the various activities in which the 'apprentice' is engaged under the guidance of the 'benefactor' constitute the greater part of the process of 'learning'. Some required instruction in various techniques (e.g., walking with fingers curled to increase stamina; ingesting peyote without becoming ill). In setting about 'tricking the apprentice', the 'benefactor' sometimes finds a 'worthy opponent' for him, usually a 'diablero' or 'diablera'; this is done in order to force the 'apprentice' to 'learn' more in order to survive encounters with this enemy (e.g., don Juan induced Castañeda to attempt to 'pierce the sorceress', La Catalina by ramming the hoof of a wild boar into her navel); in general, this involves accumulating more 'personal power', and specifically, by 'learning' techniques for 'engaging a worthy opponent' or for surviving encounters with inimical 'forces'. If one has a 'worthy opponent', it is useless to attempt to fight by 'performing sorcery with power objects' or even by 'getting a helper'; the 'apprentice' must persevere in trying to 'tame an ally'. Needless to say, a 'worthy opponent' provides sufficient motivation to 'learn' as a defeat by any of these enemies is devastating; the 'apprentice' may be 'robbed of his soul' or he may even die.

Another of don Juan's 'tricks' was to recapture Carlos' natural inclination for 'hunting'. Thus he was led to 'learn' to become a 'hunter', and engage in 'hunting power', at which a 'warrior' must succeed if he is to become a 'man of knowledge'. It is necessary to 'learn' to become 'accessible' or 'inaccessible' to 'power', and 'learn' to merge one's 'personal power' with the 'power' of the 'night' in order to master the technique for running at night by using the 'gait of power'. Also, the 'apprentice' must 'learn' how to 'store personal power' (through a 'feeling') and thus benefit from any 'battle of power'. He must be patient, however, and not try to 'meet with powers' too soon, for if one 'ventures into the unknown' without sufficient 'personal power' he will find only 'death'. A 'warrior' has 'patience' because he knows that he is 'waiting for his will'; his 'gap' is slowly opening and he must develop his 'will' in order to 'close his gap' and 'make himself solid'. (The 'gap' is a space between the 'fibers' coming out from one's navel.)

Other related activities are the making and use of a 'spirit catcher' (for 'tapping an ally' and 'detecting messages' through 'holes in sound') and 'creating power objects'. Tackling one's dreams in order to 'set up dreaming' is a parallel activity for which it is necessary to be asleep. The goal is to develop the ability to 'act' deliberately and 'control' the activity of 'dreaming' to the extent that there is no difference between what one does while awake and asleep (especially with respect to accumulating 'personal power'). The danger involved with activities which deal intimately with unknown 'forces' is that the 'apprentice' may be 'trapped' by these 'forces' before he 'learns' how to deal with them.

Besides 'hunting power', 'taming an ally' and 'learning how to see' are the most important general activities which comprise 'becoming a man of knowledge'; all other activities are subordinate. 'Taming an ally' involves 'meeting with the ally' many times until the 'apprentice' is prepared to 'tackle the ally'; this involves 'spinning with the ally'. If successful, the 'apprentice' 'becomes one with the ally' and can then 'summon the ally at will'.

The technique of 'seeing' is independent of the activity of 'taming an ally', although the same 'power plants' may be used as 'aids'. All everyday activity is 'doing', which is everything that we know how to do to something; this is what makes the 'world' as it is. 'Not-doing' is simply the technique by which we cease to constantly create the 'world' by 'doing'. 'Seeing' occurs when one has succeeded in 'stopping the world' through this technique; 'seeing' is not a matter of 'thinking' or 'talking', but of mastering the technique. This is one way in which a 'man of knowledge' may 'perceive the world'; he may actually 'feel the world' by using his eyes. A related technique is to 'find a spot' by crossing one's eyes, separating the double image and 'feeling' any change which occurs between them (e.g., change in hue of the 'colors').

When an 'apprentice' succeeds in 'becoming a 'man of knowledge' he is not only able to 'get into the other world', he may actually be able to 'bring about the world of sorcerers' by using the 'extra ring of power' which a 'man of knowledge' develops. His ultimate goal, however, will be to eventually 'sneak between the two worlds' (the 'world of ordinary men' and the 'world of sorcerers') and 'learn how to see'; after he accomplishes that, he need no longer live like a 'warrior', a 'sorcerer' or anything else.

The collection and preparation of 'power plants', as well as their use, requires 'following the rule', and demands 'respect' for the 'powers' with which one is dealing. The 'apprentice' 'learns' that with their 'aid', it is possible to engage in special non-ordinary activities, e.g., 'moving', 'flying', 'divining' (seeing what is going on in other places), 'striking a blow at a distance', etc. The circumstances surrounding the use of peyote are anomalous, for 'Mescalito' is a 'teacher' and 'protector' rather than an 'ally'. He 'teaches' the right way to live, and is a 'protector' because he is available to everyone. Such encounters usually occur at 'mitotes' in the company of other 'peyoteros' who each sing their unique peyote songs (which have been taught to them by 'Mescalito').

6. Significance

Both public and private 'experiences' or events may have significance or import in determining the course of the 'apprenticeship'. The incredible 'experiences' which the 'apprentice' encounters, both with and without the 'aid' of 'power plants' must be 'interpreted' by the 'benefactor' in order to facilitate 'learning'. (The 'benefactor's' role is to point the way and 'trick'.) Thus after each session the 'apprentice' must give a full account of his 'experiences'. Some aspects will be considered significant and influence the means of 'learning' employed by the 'benefactor'. For example, the presence of Castañeda's unfavorable 'color' on the back of the 'guardian' was an 'indication' that 'overcoming the guardian' was not his temperament, and that other means would have to be employed to enter the 'other world'.

Any observable event (with a few exceptions, such as the flying or cawing of 'crows') may be taken as an 'agreement from the world'. The timing is the crucial factor; an event occurring immediately subsequent to an assertion may be taken as a reaffirmation. Crows flying or cawing are invariably taken as 'omens' by don Juan, which may be 'indications' about someone (e.g., his 'apprentice') although 'omens' and 'indications' are for the most part independent. However, other events may also constitute 'omens' and need not all be construed post facto. The occurrence or non-occurrence of a particular event may be specified in advance as determining one or another course of 'action'.

Places, directions, colors, names, and other means of orientation, may also have a particular significance. On some 'spots' (sitios), one 'feels' naturally happy and strong; on others, one may become weakened and even physically ill. Specific 'colors', having the same effect are usually associated with each kind of 'spot'. There are 'places of power' where one may 'tap power' by means of various techniques, and a 'place of predilection', which the 'apprentice' requires as a focal point for 'storing power', and which he will have until he dies. 'Directions' have certain significance, both according to personal affinity and with respect to specific 'rules' which must be followed when practicing 'sorcery'. The 'name' of 'Mescalito' and of one's 'ally' are to be used in emergency only as invocation. When 'Mescalito' tells the 'apprentice' his 'name' (a different one in each case) it signifies full acceptance by 'Mescalito', and the 'apprentice' need never narrate further 'experiences' for 'interpretation' in this respect, but is capable of 'learning' 'Mescalito's' lesson himself.

7. Entities of Dual Nature

In don Juan's system, a physical object may be imbued with non-natural properties, thus becoming a 'power object'. A 'brujo' uses certain 'power objects', which are 'instruments', in 'performing sorcery'; however, this is only necessary when he does not yet have an 'ally'. In comparison, 'instruments' are mere toys.

'Strings' and 'spirit catchers' are not 'instruments' and are not used to 'perform sorcery'; rather, they play a role in the activities at the 'place of predilection' and 'places of power' respectively. In preparing a 'bed of strings' the 'strings' are rocks which must be placed in a circle; they have to be tossed by the 'benefactor' and picked up the 'apprentice' with no mistakes, since leaving a 'string' lying around loose could mean death for either one of them. A 'warrior' gains strength by lying on a 'bed of strings'. 'Spirit catchers' are fibers' which are used to lure 'spirits' when one wishes to 'tap their power'; they make a wailing sound if plucked when taut.

On the other hand, 'power plants' are used as an 'aid', and are the normal means by which an 'apprentice' 'tames an ally'. The two 'allies' presented in don Juan's system are the 'little smoke' and the 'devil's weed'; an 'apprentice' must eventually choose only one. The 'little smoke' has the advantage of being 'constant' in that it

is predictable and does not require 'following a rule' for its use, whereas the 'devil's weed' is not 'constant' but gives a man superfluous 'power' and one may become enslaved by it. 'Mescalito' like an 'ally', is also a 'power', but not an 'ally' because he cannot be 'tamed' and is available to everyone (i.e., anyone can collect peyote buttons and 'learn' 'Mescalito's' lessons from encountering him upon ingestion.

8. Non-Material Entities

The most general term used to designate non-material entities in don Juan's system is 'force'; this includes 'powers', 'spirits', 'guardians', etc. Two important kinds of 'power' are 'aids' such as the 'allies' and 'will', which is a 'force' linking a man to the 'world'. The 'apprentice' must 'tame an ally' and develop his 'will' in the course of 'becoming a man of knowledge'.

'Spirits' are of two kinds: those which are either powerless or inimical, and those which have gifts of 'power'. The latter are sometimes called 'allies', a possible ambiguity in the system. It is important here to draw the explicit distinction between 'helpers', which are 'spirits' from 'allies', which are 'powers'. A 'diablero' has an 'ally', but usually gets a 'helper' first from the 'other world'. The 'guardian' is the 'keeper' of the 'other world' and may be considered unique although it takes a different form for everyone. It is similar to the 'green fog' in its universal accessibility: it is always there.

'Death' is primarily regarded as a presence; nevertheless, it functions as an entity. It is personal, and has an exact location at arm's length to one's left. It is also possible to catch a glimpse of it if one is not too 'solid', or perceive its warning as a chill. A 'warrior' is constantly aware of 'death' and uses it as an advisor when things become unclear. However, 'death' is neither a 'force' nor a personage.

In don Juan's ontology, there are other entities which one is able to perceive only with the 'aid' of 'power plants' or after one 'learns to see'. Upon 'learning to become a crow', the 'apprentice' will possibly meet the 'emissaries' of his fate, in the form of 'crows' perceived as a 'crow' would see them. One may perceive 'holes' in sound as elements of a structure, and 'receive messages' through them, or perceive the 'green

fog' while in the presence of water (and with the assistance of the 'water spirit') and 'learn' how to use it to 'move' vast distances.

When one 'learns to see', he 'sees' the 'lines of the world', lines of light which connect everything to everything else. He also perceives a man as a 'luminous egg', a bundle of circulating 'fibers' of light from head to navel, with arms and legs 'seen' as bristles of 'fibers' shooting out. A man who has developed his 'will' will have a 'gap' in the 'fibers' close to his navel through which his 'will' may shoot out and 'grab onto' things as a mode of perception. However, 'will' is primarily used to affect things, and a sufficient condition for being a 'sorcerer' is that one be able to use one's 'will'. The practice of 'sorcery' (in the narrow sense) is merely the application of one's 'will' to a 'key joint'.

As the 'apprentice' pursues 'knowledge', it becomes increasingly difficult to regain 'solidity' (e.g., by being submerged in water); similarly, as his 'will' develops, his 'gap' widens and he must develop new 'shields' (e.g., against the 'allies') lest 'death' should enter through the 'gap' in his 'will' before his time is up. Ordinarily our 'doing' is our 'shields' against the 'forces' of the 'world'; a 'warrior' must make new 'shields' from the items of a 'path with heart'.

When one becomes a 'man of knowledge', one 'learns' to hook his extra 'ring of power' (which is normally hooked onto 'doing' in order to create the 'world') to 'not-doing' in order to create the 'world of sorcerers'. For example, he may appear to several people simultaneously and be perceived by each in a different guise.

9. Epistemology

The 'world' is whatever we perceive, in any mode of perception we employ. Whereas an ordinary man can only use his senses, a 'man of knowledge' may also perceive with his 'will' and by 'seeing'. When one can 'see', one realizes that the 'world' is just a description, and neither the 'world of ordinary men' nor the 'world of sorcerers' (the 'other world') is 'real' or rather they are both equally 'real' in that they can both 'act on the perceiver'. 'Reality' thus is mainly what one 'feels'. A 'real world' without a perceiver is a concept empty of practical import, and since don Juan's system is supremely practical, this amounts to

saying that the only important 'reality' is subjective. Similarly, objective 'truth' is an empty concept. Since 'action' is the only thing that counts, whether a thing is said to be 'true' or 'not true' is immaterial; a 'warrior' 'acts' in either case, to do 'doing' or 'not-doing' respectively.

Both 'explanation' and 'understanding' are de-emphasized because they play only a minor role in the system. For the most part, don Juan maintains that 'explanations' which are consistent with his system of 'sorcery' in order to lead his 'apprentice' to reject his own unsatisfactory attempts to 'explain' his 'experiences' which are incompatible with a 'sorcerer's' 'interpretation' of the 'world'. 'Understanding' is unimportant; a man is capable of 'handling' far more than what may be 'understood', and this constitutes the greater part of the 'knowledge' which the 'apprentice' seeks. The key to 'rationality' is 'learning', not 'understanding', 'acting' and 'experiencing' rather than 'explanation'.

APPENDIX E

A CATEGORIZED LIST OF CONCEPTS IN DON JUAN'S CONCEPTUAL SYSTEM

1. Persons

MAN OF KNOWLEDGE
APPRENTICE
BENEFACTOR
HUNTER
WARRIOR
SORCERER
BRUJO
DIABLERO
WORTHY OPPONENT
PEYOTERO

2. Man of Knowledge

NATURAL ENEMIES
PATH OF KNOWLEDGE
PATH WITH HEART
CONTROLLED FOLLY

3. Aspects of Persons

BODY
SOUL
MIND

4. Personal Factors

CHANGE
THE SPIRIT
PERSONAL HISTORY
SELF-IMPORTANCE
ROUTINE
INDULGENCE
ATTACHMENT
ABANDON ONESELF
ACCESSIBLE
ANGER
SOLID
COURAGE
DEFEAT
FEAR
WIDE AWAKE
RESPECT

ABSOLUTE ASSURANCE
MOOD OF A WARRIOR
CONTROL
ABANDON
BEING IN PERFECT BALANCE WITH EVERYTHING
UNBENDING INTENT
PATIENCE
ALERT
PREPARED
IMPECCABLE
TRUST IN ONE'S PERSONAL POWER
RESPONSIBILITY
DETACHMENT
DECISION
STRUGGLE
CLARITY
OLD AGE
PERSONAL POWER
TIGHT
STRATEGY
WELL-BEING
LIFE

5. Activities

BECOMING A MAN OF KNOWLEDGE
LEARNING
ACTION
BATTLE
TRICK
HUNTING
TAPPING
TRAPPING
AFFECTING
THINKING
TALKING
MITOTES
ENGAGE A WORTHY OPPONENT
CHOOSE AN APPRENTICE
HUNTING POWER
BECOMING ACCESSIBLE TO POWER
STORING PERSONAL POWER
BATTLE OF POWER
MEET WITH POWERS
CREATING POWER OBJECTS
GAIT OF POWER
GATHERING POWER PLANTS
PREPARING POWER PLANTS
USING POWER PLANTS

DREAMING
SET UP DREAMING
MAKING A SPIRIT CATCHER
USING A SPIRIT CATCHER
TAMING AN ALLY
TAPPING AN ALLY
MEETING WITH AN ALLY
TACKLING THE ALLY
SPINNING WITH THE ALLY
BECOMING ONE WITH THE ALLY
SUMMONING THE ALLY
THE ALLY REMOVING ONE'S BODY
THE ALLY CARRYING A MAN OUTSIDE HIMSELF
THE ALLY GUIDING A MAN'S ACTS
THE ALLY FURTHERING A MAN'S KNOWLEDGE
THE ALLY TAPPING SOMEONE
THE ALLY HELPING A MAN
THE ALLY ADVISING SOMEONE
THE ALLY GIVING A MAN STRENGTH
AN ALLY GIVING POWER
RULE
FOLLOWING THE RULE
PERFORMING SORCERY WITH POWER OBJECTS
PIERCING A SORCERER
LEARNING HOW TO MOVE
MOVING
FLYING
STRIKING A BLOW AT A DISTANCE
DIVINING
DETECTING MESSAGES
BEING TAPPED BY ONE'S DEATH
USING DEATH AS AN ADVISOR
SOMETHING ROBBING ONE'S SOUL
LEARNING HOW TO SEE
DOING
NOT-DOING
STOPPING THE WORLD
SEEING
SEEING PAST EVENTS
FEELING
FEELING THE WORLD
FEELING THE LINES OF THE WORLD
FINDING A SPOT
PERCEIVING THE WORLD
GETTING INTO THE OTHER WORLD
HAVING FEELINGS TOWARD THE GUARDIAN
OVERCOMING THE GUARDIAN
OVERCOMING THE GREEN FOG
GETTING A HELPER
BRING ABOUT THE WORLD OF SORCERERS

VENTURING INTO THE UNKNOWN
WAITING FOR WILL
OPENING ONE'S GAP
CLOSING ONE'S GAP
MAKING SOMEONE SOLID

6. Significance

AGREEMENT FROM THE WORLD
OMEN
INDICATION
COLOR
SPOT
PLACE OF PREDILECTION
PLACE OF POWER
DIRECTION
NAME
BEGINNING

7. Entities of Dual Nature

INSTRUMENT
POWER OBJECT
SPIRIT CATCHER
STRING
PLANT
POWER PLANT
PIPE
LITTLE SMOKE
DEVIL'S WEED
MESCALITO
WIND
LIZARD
CROW
CONSTANT

8. Non-Material Entities

FORCE
POWER
PERSONAL POWER
AID
ALLY
WILL
SPIRIT
HELPER
KEEPER
GUARDIAN

DEATH
EMISSARIES
HOLES (IN SOUND)
GREEN FOG
LINES OF THE WORLD
FIBERS
GAP
KEY JOINT
SHIELD
RING OF POWER
NIGHT
SHADOW

9. Epistemology

THE WORLD
THE WORLD OF ORDINARY MEN
THE WORLD OF SORCERERS
THE WORLD ACTING ON SOMEONE
REALITY
TRUTH
EXPLANATION
UNDERSTANDING
HANDLING
RATIONALITY

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME: Ronald Paul Leonard

PLACE OF BIRTH: Edmonton, Alberta

YEAR OF BIRTH: 1945

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION AND DEGREES

University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
1962-65
1966-67 B. Sc.
1970-75

University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario
1974-75

HONORS AND AWARDS:

University of Alberta
Teaching Fellowship
1972-73

University of Alberta
Summer Bursary
1973

University of Waterloo Graduate Scholarship
University of Waterloo
1974

University of Waterloo
Teaching Fellowship
1974

University of Waterloo
Teaching Fellowship
1974-75

University of Waterloo
Special Bursary
1975

CURRICULUM VITAE (Continued)

RELATED WORK EXPERIENCE:

Teaching Assistant
University of Alberta
1972-1973

Teaching Assistant
University of Waterloo
1974

Teaching Assistant
University of Waterloo
1974-1975